Gal. 10 G.f

THE

Church of England vindicated:

OR, A

DEFENCE

OF THE

Viſible CHURCH of CHRIST,

As Eſtabliſhed by the

Legiſlative Authority of this Realm:

In ANSWER to

ALL OBJECTIONS,

Which have been offered by

DISSIDENTS of every DENOMINATION.

WITH A

PREFATORY ADDRESS

TO THE

Pious and Learned PRELATES

OF

GREAT-BRITAIN and IRELAND.

EXETER:
PRINTED BY BARNABAS THORN:
And Sold by Him, and WALLIS, LONDON.

MDCCLXXIX.

19

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

CONTENTS
OF THIS
WORK.

In the ADDRESS.

REMARKS on a Plan of Reformation, taken from a Pamphlet, intitled, "An Addreſs to the Rational Advocates of the Church of England." Page iv

An Examination of Mr. Wilton's famous Speech, which was made in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, againſt the Expediency of all Civil and Religious Teſts; in which Examination is firſt of all proved, the Neceſſity of our Civil & Religious Teſts, to the Preſervation of our Civil and Religious Eſtabliſhments. P. xiv

Secondly, That the great Truths of Religion muſt, from the Reaſon and Nature of Things, always be different or ſeperate from Politics. P. xxi

CONTENTS.

Thirdly, Remarks on Religion's being the common Birth-Right of Man. Page xxv

Fourthly, Remarks on the wiſe Polity of the Romans in adopting into the Number of their Divinities the Gods of the Nations they ſubdued, and on its being conſiſtent with Scripture Polity to imitate their Liberality of Sentiment. P. xxx

Fifthly, On the Sacramental Teſt in particular being contrary both to Religion and Polity. P. xxxiii

Sixthly, On the Merit of Proteſtant Diſſenters in Favour of the Revolution. P. xxxiv

Objections againſt a Subſcription, by Dr. Samuel Chandler, as related by Mr. Amory. P. xxxvii

The Monthly Reviewer's Charge againſt the Biſhops. P. xliii

The Church of England not reformed upon any Lutheran or Calviniſtical Plan. P. liii

The principal Doctrines of Chriſtianity proved to be a rank Impropriety and Impoſition, if upon the Arian Principles the Divinity of Chriſt ſhall be rejected. P. lv

The Nature and Conſequence of Licentiouſneſs, as vindicated and practiced by the Monthly Reviewers. P. lxvi

INTRO-

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

An Examination of certain Reaſons, put together in the firſt Page of the Confeſſional, which have been jointly and ſeparately made uſe of by Ancient and Modern Puritans, to juſtify a refuſing to hold Religious Communion with the Eſtabliſhed Church both of Rome and England. Page 1

A ſelect Set of Obſervations, from the Preface to the Confeſſional. P. 9

Other Objections directly pointed againſt the Articles, and the Reaſonableneſs of a Subſcription. P. 17

That, according to the XXth Article, the Church hath a Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controverſies of Faith. P. 19

Objection that the Articles have no literal or grammatical Senſe in which they can be underſtood, conſidered. P. 39

Objection that the Church's Senſe of the Articles, and that of the Articles themſelves, are different from one another, conſidered. P. 58. What gave Riſe to this abſurd Charge when it was introduced, and in what Manner it has been continued to the preſent Time. P. 70

The Deſign of compiling the Articles, and the high Probability, if not the Certainty, of their Compiler. P. 82

The

CONTENTS.

The Doctrine or Doctrines contained in every Article, proved to be agreeable both to Reason and Scripture, in a brief Explication of them in their Literal and Grammatical Construction of Words, a Manner of Explication hitherto unattempted. Article 1 Page 102

2 106

3 117

4 121

5 122

6 123

7 126

8 128

9 129

10 136

11 142

12 146

13 149

14 151

15 153

16 155

17 161

18 178

19 183

20 184

21 192

22 203

Article

CONTENTS.

Article	Page
23	205
24	208
25	210
26	219
27	221
28	223
29	224
30	227
31	230
32	233
33	235
34	237
35	240
36	242
37	244
38	249
39	257

A Scripture Warrant for a direct Addreſs of Supplication, Praiſe, and Thankſgiving, to the Son and to the Holy Ghoſt. P. 108

Of different Objects of Predeſtination in God and Man. P. 169, under the 17th Article.

The Church of England vindicated againſt the Charge of Tranſubſtantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, by Lutherans and Calviniſts, and againſt that of the Church of Rome, as being a mere lifeleſs and unmeaning Ceremony. P. 215

The

CONTENTS.

The Reaſonableneſs and Expediency of requiring a Subſcription to the XXXIX Articles, from young Gentlemen in the Univerſities of Cambridge and Oxford. P. 260

On genteel Sneering and Railery againſt all Creeds, Formalities, Litanies, Liturgies, Syſtems, Canons, and Articles. P. 265

On a defamatory Inſult of Dr. Price's, in Oppoſition to the Eſtabliſhed Church of England. In a Note. P. 272

APPENDIX.

Part I. The natural Immortality of the Soul vindicated.

Part II. The Doctrine of Philoſophical Neceſſity conſidered.

AN

AN

HUMBLE ADDRESS

TO THE

PIOUS AND LEARNED

PRELATES

OF

GREAT-BRITAIN AND *IRELAND.*

IT is obſerved by the author of the Confeſſional, that he had it many years in contemplation to collect and diſpoſe of proper materials, calculated for the reformation, but more eſpecially for the ſubverſion of our religious and civil eſtabliſhments, for they are ſo nearly and intimately connected, that whatever is deſtructive of the one muſt be injurious to the other: And here it may pertinently be aſked,

Why may not an equal number of years be allowed to collect matters of fact, reasons, and arguments, from the schools of history, logic, and philosophy, for the defence as well as for the subversion of establishments? Nor could this, upon the extensive plan on which it is designed to be executed, conveniently make its appearance in the literary world, in less time than has elapsed since the original publication of this renowned Confessional.

Secondly. We allow it to be one of the best written pieces of puritanism, either antient or modern. The author of it having proved that he has a warehouse of what Tully in his oratory calls *bona verba*, or *good words*, and that he has thrown them into a certain arrangement so agreeable and entertaining as to have occasioned the entire revolt of a Jebb and a Lindsey, and even to have deceived the very Elect; I mean a few sensible men who entered into a very unnatural alliance with people of something, not unlike a babelic confusion of

sentiment

ſentiment and language, to procure a liberty from parliament to be exempted from any future ſubſcription to this primary and fundamental doctrine of our Thirty-nine Articles, "There is one living and true God, &c." becauſe upon their novelle plan of religion it is ſtrangely however ſincerely preſumed, that a conſciouſneſs of having done ſo is productive of great uneaſineſs and diſquietude of mind.

In oppoſition to certain doctrines, to modes of religious ceremony and public worſhip, as eſtabliſhed by the legiſlative authority of this realm, it is a well known matter of fact to the moſt literate and judicious part of mankind, and is confirmed by every ſucceeding lunary publication, that the arts of genteel ſneering and raillery, with repeated ſtrokes of agreeable declamation and oratorical repreſentations, are not attended with the neceſſary proceſſes of ſound reaſoning and juſt philoſophy. To prove this matter of fact, how-

ever ſtrange it may appear to our Engliſh diſſidents at large, I ſhall make a few pertinent animadverſions on the following extracts from our moſt renowned champion abettors of novelty and diſſention.

I. From a pamphlet called, An Addreſs to the Rational Advocates of the Church of England: — "I have actually now under examination the heads of a well digeſted plan, deſigned by a maſterly hand: It only waits a convenient ſeaſon to be recommended to the government; though I much doubt its ſucceſs till the clamorous oppoſition of ignorant zealots and falſe brethren (who, for private conſiderations, ſhudder and turn pale at the flighteſt hint of opening a door to reformation,) ſhall be effectually ſilenced by the public ſcorn and predominant influence of truth."

Firſt. We are charitably inclined to give this diſſident all deſirable credit, for actually having a plan under examination; but that it is a well digeſted one, and deſigned by a maſterly

maſterly hand, are points concerning which we beg leave to heſitate, and for which we require better authority. That it only waits a convenient ſeaſon to be recommended to the government, is highly probable; and that ignorant zealots and falſe brethren may ſhudder and turn pale at the ſlighteſt hint of opening a door to reformation, we eſteem very poſſible; but that the ſincere members and advocates of the Church of England are ignorant zealots and falſe brethren, a doctrine which he means to inſinuate (if his head is capacious enough to receive any political ſenſe or meaning,) is ſomething which muſt be an eternal point of diffidence between arians and trinitarians; and when our lutherans and calviniſts ſhall give truth a more reſpectable dreſs and appearance than ſhe has received from the eſtabliſhed Church of England, I ſhall be forward to pay her ſome extraordinary compliments upon the occaſion, and to uſe all my intereſt for preparing and adorning a temple fit for her reception: But all this buſineſs muſt be poſtponed,

poſtponed, till this well digeſted plan and maſterly deſigner ſhall be eſcorted to St. James's under the preſbytery guards of Geneva or Holland; and when ſuch a convenient ſeaſon will offer itſelf, I am ſure this writer has not ſufficient abilities to divine.

Secondly. From this particular phraſe, "To ſhudder and turn pale," ſince it is every where the language of the Confeſſional upon ſimilar occaſions, in all probability it was taken from the ſame budget of a ſound puritan and ſtaunch republican. The pamphlet, of which this paragraph is an abſtract, is highly extolled by the monthly reviewers, as written in a ſpirit of true proteſtant liberty; a phraſe of which theſe eminent critics are extremely fond and liberal. And it is a matter of perpetual defence and conſolation to the members of our eſtabliſhed church, that every diſſident's cry for reformation is unſupported by any adepts in logic and philoſophy, who can be ſaid to act conſiſtent with

with the common taſte and rules of literature, either antient or modern; it being evident, that the beſt digeſted plans of reformation are confined in the workhouſes of the brain, and to the unilluminated ſhops of the pocket, and that the maſterly deſigners of them, for any thing which appears to the contrary, are ſtill dormitating on the dirty benches of ignorance and hypocriſy.

II. From the Monthly Review for June 1773, when political and religious factions were writing in the ſunſhine of licentiouſneſs, and from the author of "Reflections on the Fate of the Petition," we have the following remarkable evomitions of pride and inſolence, inſtead of any thing which wears the honeſt aſpect of truth and argument; nor ought we to turn a deaf ear to the voice of good polity, in expoſing them to the public ſcorn of charity, politeneſs, and truth.——— From the Monthly Review we read thus, "But the governors of the church are deaf to all remonſtrances,

remonſtrances, they are at eaſe in the enjoyment of their emoluments, they are aſleep, and nothing will awaken them, till the Church of England falls to pieces, and they are buried under its ruins." From The Fate of the Petition, p 66, we are told, "There may be times and ſeaſons when men of conſcience may become the majority, and riſe up in a formidable body againſt the eſtabliſhment." And from page the 4th we read, "That patriots have inſinuated, that the intrigues of the cabinet have a plain tendency to arbitrary rule."

Firſt. Each of theſe quotations are pregnant with the higheſt inſult to the wiſdom and authority of legiſlation; though in ſome dirty corner of public criticiſm they have had the honour of being ſtamped with the ſeal of true proteſtant liberty of licentiouſneſs. And on the firſt of theſe, which is equally poor in language as in ſenſe, I ſhall only make this ſingle animadverſion: That our preſent adverſaries will never perhaps have gigantic ſtrength enough

enough to pull down the eſtabliſhed church, nor of conſequence the opportunity and pleaſure of burying your lordſhips under its ruins. Nor can any thing but the moſt infernal kind of malevolence or miſanthropy, expreſs a greater degree of pleaſure to ſee men of piety, learning, and of the higheſt ability, to defend the important documents of revelation, on the racks of poverty, public contempt, and perſecution, than to behold them in a ſtate of eaſe, emolument, and dignity.

Secondly. If the Monthly Reviewers are infallible in practiſing the magical arts of divination, the meaning of the two laſt paragraphs was machinated in the ſame ſophiſtical ſchools of falſe logic as the Confeſſional; whoſe abilities, if a ſimilarity of ſtyle is any probable indication and characteriſtic of a particular genius, have been often diſplayed in the Houſe of Commons, and in the name of Luttrel, in the moſt virulent ſpirit of ſatyrical reflection on the king and his adminiſtration.

Thirdly. In a peculiar air of peremptory and prophetic declaration, we are threatened with times and ſeaſons, when men of conſcience will become the majority, and will riſe up in a formidable body againſt the eſtabliſhment; and no doubt but this formidable majority will exert all their might and policy for an accompliſhment of its utter deſtruction. And from hence we are preſented with the moſt full and ſatisfactory demonſtration, that every thing which is related to conſcience, virtue, erudition, and great abilities, is at preſent confined to the minority Prieſleyan and Pricean academies of religious chymiſtry, of artificial and arbitrary logarithms. It becomes us therefore to watch with all due attention and diligence, ſince we are aſſured, upon the beſt authority, that when republicans and preſbyters ſhall be once more ſecurely fixed on the ſaddles of civil and eccleſiaſtical government, they will not only ſhew their teeth, but will bite and devour moſt inhumanly, without the beſt indulgences of toleration or mercy.

III.

III. Another objection, which is given by our adverſaries to a conformity with the eſtabliſhed church, is founded on a remarkable and intereſting piece of intelligence, which has been notified to the members of every diſſenting conventicle by a ſet of men, called patriots, who claim the honour of being eſteemed the moſt honeſt and judicious part of mankind; affirming, that no one can be concerned in the common offices and departments of our civil and eccleſiaſtical adminiſtrations, without falling into ſuch contaminations and impurities of humanity, as every good proteſtant clerical and lay divine muſt abhor, even to an execration. From puritanic patriots then it has been notified, in the utmoſt ſecrecy and confidence, that the intrigues of the cabinet have a peculiar tendency to arbitrary rule. So that from every Zuinglian's public prayer are ſlowly iſſued forth obligations to fidelity and allegiance, but vociferouſly and ferociouſly is ſounded forth arbitrary rule, and of conſequence a right to inſurgency, and to all

the probable emoluments of rebellion. Nor can I help making on this point the the following political and religious reflection: That our patriotic diſſidents are prodigiouſly diſquieted, even almoſt to degrees of inſanity, becauſe the king will not reſolve to turn republican, and abdicate the crown. It is extremely natural indeed for royalty itſelf, and for every branch of it, to be tenacious of all its regal powers and prerogatives; but that his preſent Majeſty ever attempted to get more than is conſiſtent with the eſtabliſhed liberties of the ſubject, is an unfavourable inſinuation, and may be conſidered as a ſtone taken from the bag of republican diſſidents, and aimed at the forehead of our civil and religious conſtitutions. It behoveth therefore the majority members of our eſtabliſhed church to watch and to oppoſe, in the greateſt poſſible unity, fortitude, and magnanimity of reſolution, the united efforts of political and independent puritans.

IV. There is ſomething very remarkable in the literal conſtruction of the

ſenſe

ſenſe and meaning of certain words which were thrown out by one Mr. Wilton in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, with a deſign (if they can be ſaid to have any deſign) to prove the unreaſonableneſs of civil and religious teſts; on which I ſhall here make ſome animadverſions, becauſe they will moſt directly and particularly exhibit the point on which turneth the controverſy between the Church of England and her diſſidents of every denomination. This Mr. Wilton, in a ſimilar mode of ſentiment and language with the Confeſſional, thus ſmartly and (in the opinion of every tribe of diſſenters) moſt judiciouſly declares, "That he abhorred all thoſe religious diſtinctions which it was the calamity of former times to convert into teſts. That religion ſhould in all inſtances be ſeparated from politics, for that as the paſſing air, ſo it was the common birthright of man; and, like the tyrant of old, you might as well impoſe a tax on breathing, as lay a temporal reſtraint on the liberty of conſcience and

private

private judgment. It was the wiſe polity of the Romans to adopt into the number of their divinities the gods of the nations they ſubdued, and that we ſhould imitate their liberality of ſentiment. That the ſacramental teſt was diſagreeable to policy and religion; and that the merits of proteſtant diſſenters, in favour of the revolution, had been acknowledged by a vote of the Iriſh Commons in the year 1695, and of the Engliſh three years after."

Firſt. When this Iriſh ſpeecher ſays, "That religious diſtinctions are convertible into teſts," it is a propoſition utterly unmeaning and unintelligible; for the religious diſtinctions of atheiſm and idolatry, of deiſts and arians, of popery and calviniſm, as they exiſt in the minds of men, muſt be conſidered as the entire productions of corrupted nature, or of ill-educated reaſon, and not as the creation or productions of a teſt. And ſince he appears utterly ignorant of the nature and deſign of a teſt, we will undertake briefly to inform

inform him how neceſſary it is to the preſervation of our religious and civil eſtabliſhments: We may venture to affirm, that the word *teſt* was derived from the latin word *teſtis*, which ſignifieth a witneſs; and therefore the word *teſt* may be ſaid to be a witneſs, proof, evidence, or declaration to the civil magiſtrate, and to ſociety at large, of a good intention to do ſomething which a man is ſuppoſed to engage or promiſe to do in a readineſs of will and ſincerity of heart; all which will be clearly illuſtrated in the three following inſtances, in reference to oaths taken in our common courts of judicature, to the oaths of qualification, and to a ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles. An oath taken in a common court of judicature is a teſt, or ſolemn declaration to the civil magiſtrate, and to ſociety at large, of a ſincere intention to ſpeak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, concerning the preſent matter of enquiry and judgment; and I muſt ſay, that this kind of teſts is warranted not only by the autho-

rity

rity of human, but alſo of divine legiſlation; nor, to an honeſt man, did I ever hear of it's being eſteemed any way offenſive or diſguſtful.

The oaths of qualification imply a ſimilar teſt or declaration, as we are accountable to God and to ſociety for our intentions, of a man's reſolving to act the part of a loyal, peaceable, and dutiful ſubject, by refuſing to enter into any conſpiracies againſt the perſon and government of the ſupreme civil magiſtrate, and by engaging to diſcover ſuch, when ſupported by any probable intelligence or information: Nor to a native or ſubject of Great-Britain who (from a ſenſe of obligations of duty and intereſt) is reſolved, as he ought to do, to defend the ſupreme civil magiſtrate and his country againſt all foreign invaſions, public and private conſpiracies; can theſe oaths, or this civil teſt, be judged any way offenſive, loathſome, or diſagreeable. And with regard to a ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles, ſince they contain the following truths,

truths, doctrines, propoſitions, and real matters of fact, There is one living and true God, everlaſting, without body, parts, or paſſions, of infinite power, wiſdom, and goodneſs, the maker and preſerver of all things, both viſible and inviſible; the divinity of Chriſt, his incarnation, crucifixion, reſurrection, and aſcenſion; a future ſtate of exiſtence and judgment; the ſalvation of mankind, through the merits and interceſſion of Chriſt; the divine inſtitution of two ſacraments only; and, in the character of a proteſtant, the unreaſonableneſs of the doctrine of ſuperogation, tranſubſtantiation, of worſhipping ſaints, reliques, and images; of refuſing the ſacramental cup to the laity; and that the pope, nor any foreign potentate, hath a right to exerciſe any civil or eccleſiaſtical authority within the dominions and territories of the preſent King of Great-Britain. Now ſince ſuch important truths, doctrines, propoſitions, and real matters of fact, are contained in the thirty-nine articles, a ſubſcription to them is a teſt, or teſtimony, proof, or decla-

ration, to the civil magiſtrate, and to ſociety at large, of a man's ſincere intention, under the influence of a belief in the being and providence of God, to act the part of an honeſt man, a chriſtian and proteſtant, and that upon all occaſions he will defend the civil and religious eſtabliſhments of this his chriſtian and proteſtant country; and why therefore to a proteſtant chriſtian ſhould ſuch a teſt, ſubſcription, or declaration, be any way diſagreeable? Or why ſhould he not conform with equal degrees of readineſs as ſincerity? And I may add, that whoever lives without any degree of ſerioufneſs or attention to things of this nature, is utterly unqualified to fill any public office or ſtation in either of the diſtinct provinces of church or ſtate government.

Secondly. If definitions were given of particular words, which are the objects of controverſy, it would be the ſhorteſt way of ending it; and therefore I give the following definition of a teſt: That it is one

or

or more rules of good polity, of which an inſtitution and practice is neceſſary to the preſervation of ſomething which is judged to be true, good, perfect, or excellent, in itſelf, uſeful to individuals, and to ſociety at large. And it may be thus clearly illuſtrated in the three inſtances juſt mentioned.

Firſt. The teſt, which I call an oath adminiſtered and taken in our common courts of judicature, has a natural tendency to preſerve in the minds of men a lively ſenſe of God and his providence, of their duty to him, to their neighbour, and to ſociety at large; as it regards a deteſtation and abhorrence of a lye, which muſt be one of the rankeſt abominations to an infinitely juſt and righteous God, to whom we are all accountable.

Secondly. That teſt which I call the oaths of qualification, naturally tends to excite and preſerve a lively ſenſe of the two principal bleſſings of ſociety, commonly

expreſſed by a protection of perſon and property, and of which the ſupreme civil magiſtrate of every country muſt be the immediate cauſe or inſtrument. And this teſt naturally tends alſo to excite and preſerve in a ſubject's mind a true ſenſe of that love and fear, reverence and duty, which the ſupreme civil magiſtrate rightfully challengeth for a reaſon ſo intereſting and important.

Thirdly. That teſt which is a ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles, is directly calculated to preſerve in the minds of men a lively ſenſe of the being and perfections of God, of the divinity of Chriſt, of the true revealed religion of the goſpel, of the grand miracles on which his divinity is founded, and of our eſtabliſhed proteſtant religion, as defœcated or refined from the groſs ſuperſtitions and impurities of popery. And why a proteſtant chriſtian ſhould refuſe to ſubſcribe to theſe primary truths and doctrines of proteſtantiſm, requires greater abilities to juſtify than have hitherto been

been diſplayed in any liviathan compoſitions of a Price or a Prieſtly.

From theſe occaſional animadverſions I ſhall proceed briefly and particularly to examine the ſeveral parts of this remarkable ſpeech, which was deſigned to prove the unreaſonableneſs of every civil or religious teſt.

Firſt. When this Iriſh reaſoner ſays, "That religion ſhould in all inſtances be ſeparated from politics," if he means that religion, or any object of preſervation, ſhould be ſeparated or muſt be different from politics or certain rules of good polity, the inſtitution and practice of which is neceſſary to its preſervation and continuance, this is a plain and unobjectionable propoſition; nor upon enquiry will the Church of England be found to have done any thing in this caſe which is deſerving of the leaſt degree of reprehenſion or cenſure. For the great matters of fact and truths of religion are, the being, perfections, and providence of God; a future

ſtate

ſtate of exiſtence and judgment; and, with regard to a practice of morality, chaſtity, temperance, honeſty, or univerſal charity and righteouſneſs, theſe are the great truths alſo both of natural and revealed religion, without which the word *religion* is utterly unmeaning and unintelligible.

Now the particular rules of good polity by which the great truths of religion are preſerved in the minds of men, conſidered as members of a political body and of private families, are evidently held out to us in the building of churches, and in adorning them as it becometh the houſes of God, in which it is believed that he is moſt immediately and peculiarly preſent in the inſtitution and obſervance of a ſabbath, in ſuch mode, form, or manner, of ſerving, honouring, and worſhipping God, as in our common prayer book is preſcribed by the legiſlative authority of this realm. And theſe rules of good polity, for preſerving in the hearts and conſciences of men a lively ſenſe of God and his univerſal

verſal providence, are warranted by the concurrent declarations of divine and human authority. From hence is eaſily deducible the neceſſity of a prieſthood, and that no one in a ſpirit of wantonneſs or indifference can refuſe to attend upon the holy ordinances of religion, without a manifeſt violation of duty both towards God and man. But ſince, from the nature and reaſon of things, religion, health, the world to which we belong, or any thing which is conſidered as the immediate object of preſervation, always has been, and muſt be, ſeparate or different from any rules of good polity, the inſtitution and practice of which is neceſſary to it's preſervation and continuance, when this Iriſhman chargeth the eſtabliſhed churches of Great-Britain and Ireland with blending of religion and politics; ſince theſe things are proved to be utterly diſſociable, and therefore not capable of being incorporated, Mr. Wilton may be juſtly ſaid to fall by his own weight into the common lumber-houſe of Iriſh blunders.

And if this point had been always ſufficiently attended to, That the primary and inviſible truths of religion are very different things from certain viſible rules of religious and good polity, which have been here particularly ſpecified, no Anthony, Collins, Shaftſbury, Bolingbroke, or Hume, had ever inſinuated, that religion is an engine contrived by the prieſts to keep the people in ſubjection; becauſe the creation of the ſun, moon, ſtars, and of all the planetary orbs of the univerſe, their preſervation and continuance under the perpetual influences of an active and ever watchful providence, the reaſonableneſs of worſhipping the infinitely wiſe and good author of our being, and the neceſſity of a future ſtate of exiſtence and judgment upon principles of univerſal righteouſneſs and equity, are no objects of craft or invention in the moſt ſagacious layman or judicious divine.

Great men indeed, and potentates of the earth, are fully perſuaded, that inferiors

ſeriors ought to be frequently employed in doing ſomething which is contributory to their honour and ſervice; but there are unhappy mortals in every part of the world, who do not think that the Almighty has done any thing for his creatures for which they ought to be grateful in rendering him the honour and glories of private devotion and public worſhip. Though, if any credit is due to hiſtory, no civilized nation ever exiſted without a religion: And I ſhall only add upon this momentous point, that, in my opinion, no human ſociety, under the advantages of education and literature, will ever be permitted to exiſt under the ſecret diſpenſations of grace, in an univerſal contempt of God's ſupreme dominion and ſovereignty.

Secondly. This unlogical reaſoner obſerves, "That religion, as the paſſing air, is the common birthright of man; and, like the tyrant of old, you might as well impoſe a tax on breathing, as lay a temporal reſtraint on the liberty of conſcience and private judgment."

Firſt. That religion is the common birthright of man, is a propoſition which, to avoid diſpute, (for it is a very ambiguous point) ſhall at preſent be no object of controverſy. But with equal propriety it may be aſſerted, that irreligion alſo is the common birthright of man; and then the compleat propoſition of this Iriſhman's creed will ſtand clearly and briefly thus: That atheiſm is the birthright of an atheiſt, theiſm of a theiſt, mohammediſm of a mohammed, idolatry of an idolater, and chriſtianity of a chriſtian. And if we chooſe to follow this Iriſh puritan ſomewhat farther into different ſectaries, it may be ſaid, that arianiſm is the birthright of an arian, preſbytery of a preſbyterian, independency of an independent, and popery of a papiſt. And if we attend this Iriſh commoner to the different forms of civil governments, it may be affirmed, that monarchy is the birthright of a monarchian, republicaniſm of a republican, ariſtocracy of an ariſtocratic, and democracy of a democratic. But, allowing this gentry their

reſpective

reſpective birthrights, have they all a divine right to demand of the ſupreme civil magiſtrate of this realm an exaltation to the rank and emoluments of admirals and generals in our mixed monarchial ſtate, or to the dignity and emoluments of archbiſhops and biſhops upon a trinitarian and epiſcopalian eſtabliſhment? And this is an important queſtion, which I ſhall allow our diſſidents at large all reaſonable time to conſider and determine.

Secondly. When he ſays, "That you may as well impoſe a tax on breathing as lay a temporal reſtraint on liberty of conſcience and private judgment." Let us firſt of all deſire this gentleman to change his phraſe, *Liberty of conſcience*, for *private opinion*, becauſe his phraſe, "Liberty of conſcience," has no meaning; and let him throw out his word *temporal*, for which he ought to have ſubſtituted *temporary*, becauſe this word, in its preſent ſituation, is all ſound and no ſenſe. And now with the utmoſt propriety we do

affirm, that no man can be any otherwiſe to himſelf than what his private opinions, judgment, deſigns, and reſolutions, ſhall to himſelf repreſent and declare him to be. And from hence it is evident, that theſe things are in themſelves equally unreſtrainable or incapable of reſtraint, as breathing is of taxation in the hands of a tyrant, either old or young. But notwithſtanding, this Iriſh puritan will inſiſt upon it, that civil and religious teſts have a natural tendency, and were deſigned to lay what he calls a temporal or temporary reſtraint upon a man's private opinions and judgment, though it is indiſputably certain that ſuch things are no objects of reſtraint or coercion; ſo that in ſpite, and even deſpite, of all inſtructions which can be received from the ſchools of cool headed logicians and philoſophers, he will be perpetually running into the bogs of error, miſtake, and abſurdities. But the real matter of fact is this, that whereas every private man may be ſaid to have his friends and his foes, and to erect ſome teſt to himſelf,

ſelf, for diſtinguiſhing one from the other; ſo it may alſo be affirmed, with equal juſtice, that the ſupreme civil magiſtrate of every ſeparate country in Europe, from an unavoidable diverſity of opinion and judgment, muſt have friends and enemies to his perſon, religion, and government; and therefore both human and divine wiſdom or polity do preſcribe the erection of ſome civil and religious teſts, by which they are to be diſtinguiſhed: For inſtance, jacobites and republicans muſt be enemies to the perſon and mixed monarchial government of the ſupreme civil magiſtrate of this realm; that arians, preſbyterians or lutherans, calviniſts, and papiſts, muſt be enemies alſo to his eſtabliſhed religion. Now men of theſe different denominations, as honeſt men, cannot comply with our civil and religious teſts, which are repreſented by the oaths of qualification, and by a ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles; for enemies, in or out of power, will be enemies; but in ſtations of dignity, of great authority and emoluments, in church

or

or ſtate, they muſt have opportunities of acting more injuriouſly, efficaciouſly, and expeditiouſly, for the ſubverſion of ſomething, which as chriſtians and proteſtants, till our mode of religious and political ſentiment is altered, we are determined to preſerve. And in this view of things I hope that our civil and religious teſts will be continued as long as the ſun and moon endureth, or from one generation to another, till all the ſubjects of Great-Britain ſhall be united in one mode of opinion and judgment.

Thirdly. "It was the wiſe polity of the Romans (ſays this Iriſh divine and politician) to adopt into the number of their divinities the gods of the nations they ſubdued, and that we ſhould imitate their liberality of ſentiment."

Firſt. When it is ſaid, That we chriſtians ought to imitate the liberality of the Romans, by attempting an unnatural, and therefore impoſſible, incorporation of monotheiſm,

monotheiſm and polytheiſm, or to worſhip the one true living God of heaven and of the univerſe, in conjunction with the falſe and idolatrous gods of the heathen, never was ſo rank a falſhood, abſurdity, or contradiction, introduced into the literary world for a plain and important propoſition. Nor have we any lay-divine who ever diſcovered ſuch a profundity of ignorance, concerning the plain and primary truths of the revealed religion, both of the law and the goſpel.

Secondly. For this lay-divine never conſidered, that both Greeks and Romans, as idolaters or polytheiſts, might eaſily unite in one mode of religious faith, ſacrificial worſhip, and ſentimental form of addreſs. And ſince it was believed by each of theſe gentiles, that a providential government of human affairs was adminiſtered by a multiplicity of gods; when therefore a Greek or a Roman ſhould travel into any other idolatrous country, he would naturally unite, even upon his own religious principles,

ciples, with its inhabitants in the ſame mode of ſacrificial worſhip and ſentimental form of addreſs to that particular deity, under whoſe providential tutelage and protection they were ſuppoſed to be received. But, allowing this religious union of polytheiſts of different countries, does it follow from hence that there can be the ſame eaſy incorporation, in matters of religious faith, between monotheiſts and polytheiſts, or of the profeſſors of one only true living God of heaven and of the univerſe, and of thoſe who profeſs a multiplicity of creating and providentially governing deities? No doubt but this queſtion muſt eaſily determine itſelf againſt that Roman liberality, which is here recommended to the practice of a chriſtian. Beſides this, can our Iriſh divine be ſo ignorant as not to know that it was contrary to the will of God that idolatry ſhould be tolerated under the diſpenſation of the law, and what reaſon can be given why it ſhould not be equally repugnant to the will of God to tolerate idolatry under that of the goſpel? But no wonder that

ſuch

ſuch abſurdities and contradictions ſhould ariſe, when a chriſtian ſhall take his rule of religious faith and practice from an idolatrous code, and not from the revealed religions of the law and the goſpel.

Fourthly. We are informed, in a full peremptory deciſiveneſs of infallibility, "That the ſacramental teſt is contrary to religion and polity."---It is this Iriſhman's peculiar misfortune to make uſe of words in a fullneſs of ſound but emptineſs of ſenſe. To prove this, let me briefly obſerve, that every one, when he takes the ſacrament in that particular mode of ſentiment and language which is preſcribed by the legiſlative authority of this realm, makes a public acknowledgment of the primary truths of natural and revealed religion, ſuch as the being, perfections, and univerſal providence of God, and of his comfortable hopes of redemption and ſalvation through the divine merits and interceſſion of Chriſt. How therefore can a public acknowledgment of theſe primary

truths of natural and revealed religion be contrary to religion? And if it is conſiſtent with the rules of good polity, to preſerve a lively ſenſe of theſe primary truths of natural and revealed religion in the minds and conſciences of men, how can it be inconſiſtent with polity to require an occaſional declaration and confeſſion of them? And I ſhall only add, that the ſupreme civil magiſtrate of this realm does not chooſe to take any diſſenter into his ſervice, who cannot, upon his knees, condeſcend to pray the favour of his God, as well as to aſk temporal preferment of a man.

Fifthly. In the laſt place, we are informed, "That the merit of proteſtant diſſenters, in favour of the revolution, had been acknowledged by a vote of Iriſh Commons in the year 1695, and of the Engliſh three years after." Whatever opinions we may be diſpoſed to entertain of Mr. Wilton's political abilities and religious turn of ſentiment, there is no doubt but the author of the Confeſſional in a

Pricean

Pricean and Prieſtleyan confederacy have employed a printing-preſs in different parts of his Majeſty's dominions. As to the merit of proteſtant diſſenters in favour of the glorious revolution, for the accompliſhment of which the clerical and lay divines of our eſtabliſhed church diſplayed the higheſt literate abilities and magnanimity of reſolution, theſe proteſtant diſſenters may juſtly be ſaid to have had the choice only of two evils, I mean *popery* or *proteſtantiſm*, under the external and diſagreeable circumſtances of royalty and epiſcopacy. And, from what we experience of the malignity and fallibility of human diſpoſitions and judgment, there is good reaſon to believe that our proteſtant diſſidents at large, and preſbyterians in particular, would rejoice to ſeize an opportunity to effect another revolution, even in a duple alliance with patriots and papiſts, in a ſtruggle, for which they ſhould ſtand a chance to do in the ſecond what could not be done in the firſt, I mean to exterminate royalty and epiſcopacy from their

multifarious, irregular, incoherent, and unſyſtematical plan of ſimple proteſtantiſm, which though unattended with any attractive and reverential appearances of corporeal ſplendor and magnificence, yet is equally inacceſſible, arbitrary, and cruel, in executing the unlimited demands of an infallible puritaniſm, as an hot-brained Leo, or a depoſing Gregory.

In occaſional animadverſions on theſe remarkable parts of Mr. Wilton's ſpeech, which was delivered in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, I have endeavoured to give the intelligent reader a clear view of the particular points concerning the expediency of civil and religious teſts, on which turneth the controverſy between the Church of England and her proteſtant diſſidents of every denomination. And I ſhall conclude this addreſs to your lordſhips with a few reflections on ſome particular inſolent and uncharitable aſſertions, which have been thrown out by ſome eminent diſſenters, with a deſign to propagate an unfavourable

able opinion of the articles, and of the eſtabliſhed forms of our religious diſcipline and worſhip.

Firſt. There was a diſſenting teacher, called Amory, a man of no inconſiderable eminence in the calviniſtical ſchools of diſputation, who profeſſing ſome merit in the ſcience of biography has related the few following incidents in the life of the late Samuel Chandler, concerning his refuſal of preferment in the church, upon account of a ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles. There is ſomething in this Amory's manner of ſcriptitation which is ſo utterly void of all pretenſions to the buſineſs of argument, but pregnant at the ſame time with the higheſt inſult to the wiſdom and authority of legiſlation, as to deſerve being noticed by the clergy in general of our eſtabliſhed church. Thus he hath written, and thus in his conventicle he declaimed :

"The high reputation which he, or Samuel Chandler, had gained by his defences

fences of the chriſtian religion, procured him from ſome of the governors of the eſtabliſhed church the offer of conſiderable preferments, which he nobly refuſed."— That he refuſed is a matter of fact, for which he ſhall have all deſirable credit; but that there was more nobleneſs than folly in the refuſal, is far from being ſelf-evident.

"He valued (ſays this declaimer) more than theſe the liberty and integrity of his conſcience, and ſcorned for any worldly conſideration to profeſs, as divine truths, doctrines which he did not really believe, and to practice in religion what he did not inwardly approve."— An honourable ſacrifice to truth and honeſty; as to liberty of conſcience, I do not know that any man's conſcience can be unfree, becauſe no man can be any otherwiſe to himſelf than his private opinions ſhall declare him to be; but if a man voluntarily preacheth a doctrine which he does not believe, I allow that in this caſe what I call an integrity

integrity of conſcience muſt be greatly vulnerated.

Secondly. I do not mean to depreciate the abilities of Mr. Chandler, as a good writer and a good ſcholar; but why muſt his opinion be eſteemed of greater weight in matters of controverſy than that of gentlemen of the Church of England, who muſt be allowed to have had equal, if not ſuperior, abilities and a ſuperior taſte for every branch of polite literature? Since it is ſaid, that Mr. Chandler ſcorned to profeſs as divine truths any of the primary doctrines of chriſtianity and proteſtantiſm which are contained in the thirty-nine articles, ſuch as the being, perfections, and providence of God, the divinity of Chriſt, his incarnation, crucifixion, reſurrection, and aſcenſion, the ſufficiency of the holy ſcriptures to ſalvation, a future ſtate of exiſtence and judgment, and the hopes of ſalvation through the divine merits and interceſſion of Chriſt, with a rejection of certain ſuperſtitious and falſe

falſe doctrines of popery, as repugnant to reaſon and ſcripture, and which we have had frequent occaſion to enumerate; ſince I ſay this calviniſtical divine ſcorned to profeſs as divine truths or to ſubſcribe to theſe primary doctrines of chriſtianity and proteſtantiſm, inſtead of making an honourable ſacrifice (as Amory was pleaſed to call it) to truth and honeſty, was an honourable ſacrifice to infidelity and falſhood. For a full repreſentation of this matter let us throw it into the following form of logical depoſition and argument.

Firſt. Whoever ſhall refuſe to ſubſcribe to the doctrines of atheiſm, upon a ſuppoſition of being invited by an offer of preferments, may be juſtly ſaid to make an honourable ſacrifice to truth and honeſty. And whoever ſhall refuſe to ſubſcribe to the doctrines of theiſm and chriſtianity, when invited to do ſo by offers of preferment, muſt be juſtly ſaid, in this reverſe of poſition, to make an honourable ſacrifice to atheiſm and infidelity; for which this diſ-

ſenting

ſenting teacher is ſaid to have been well compenſated, or to have had his full recompenſe of reward in the generoſity of his diſſenters. Nor is there any way to evade the force of this logical argument but by an aſſertion of a moſt palpable falſhood, that the primary truths of theiſm and chriſtianity are not contained in the thirty-nine articles.

Secondly. Mr. Amory's biographical deſcription concludes with the following religious and preſbytery turn of ſentiment, "We truſt that he is among the dead." On which I ſhall beg leave thus briefly to animadvert: We members of the eſtabliſhed Church of England believe, that after death we ſhall be admitted into the heavenly regions of the living ſpirits of juſt men made perfect. But our living diſſidents are fully perſuaded, that their whole humanity, after death, will be confined in the grave-repoſitories of inanimation or inſenſibility. And they have my benevolent wiſh to make themſelves happy in ſuch a diſſenting and extravagant choice.

In the Monthly Review for 1774, which contains obſervations on the Biſhop of Carliſle's pamphlet on a ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles, there is ſomething, if it can deſerve to be called ſomething, on which I ſhall make the following animadverſions. And no doubt but it muſt be ſomething big with the fate of the whole chriſtian world, becauſe it is ferociouſly iſſued forth from not only the moſt eminent critics of England but of all Europe. Let all Europe therefore attend to this important and declamatory eruption of theſe unparalelled and ſophiſtic militants in the Genevan ſchools of republicaniſm and preſbytery, upon the preſcribed modes of worſhip and diſcipline in our eſtabliſhed church, and on your lordſhips' public character as proteſtants and prelates.

"The public (we are told) is indebted for thoſe conſiderations to a very worthy prelate of diſtinguiſhed abilities. And every impartial reader will, we doubt not, after an attentive peruſal of them, readily acknowledge

acknowledge that they do his lordſhip credit. It is matter of great ſatisfaction to us, and will give pleaſure, we hope, to every ſincere proteſtant, to ſee a perſon of his lordſhip's character appear publicly in defence of religious liberty, and ſupport the glorious cauſe with ſo much ability, at a time when moſt of his brethren on the bench ſhew ſo great an indifference (to ſpeak in the ſofteſt terms) toward every ſcheme for promoting a reformation of our eccleſiaſtical conſtitution (what an extravagant piece of impertinence is here, to put in a claim to a conſtitution which is none of theirs). If their lordſhips ſeriouſly conſider and reflect upon their late conduct, both with regard to the petitioning clergy and the proteſtant diſſenters, they cannot poſſibly think one can imagine, that the part they have acted does them honour in the opinion of judicious and unprejudiced perſons. Great allowances are undoubtedly to be made for the prejudices of their education, their political views and connections, the difficulties attending any

ſcheme of reformation, &c. However it is impoſſible, by the utmoſt ſtretch of candour and charity, to account for their conduct upon any principles that are conſiſtent with their having a ſupreme and prevailing regard to the honour of chriſtianity and the intereſts of truth. This will no doubt be looked upon by a certain claſs of men as very injurious to their lordſhips' character. We are neither afraid or aſhamed however (it being a clear point, that they are not aſhamed of any thing) of declaring our ſentiments publicly on this head with the utmoſt freedom, as we know that many of the wiſeſt and beſt of men that this or any other country can boaſt of, are of the ſame opinion: And we may venture to challenge, and we do challenge (and your challenge ſhall be accepted and anſwered) the boldeſt and warmeſt of their advocates to ſhew the conſiſtency of their conduct with what ought to be the diſtinguiſhing character of every truly proteſtant biſhop."

Firſt

Firſt. It is amazing that our eminent critics ſhould claim the liberty of ſweeping off into their circle of arian and hæretical fraternity this great man, who not long after his taking a maſter's degree engaged in the Jackſonian controverſy, perpetually oppoſing Mr. Jackſon in every repreſentation of his mode, in which we were taught to conceive of ſpace and immenſity, as it was ſuppoſed to imply a rejection of our chriſtian trinity. And indeed he hath written ſo long and ſo much upon the ſubject of ſpace, having left no room for his own ſpiritual exiſtence, 'till the momentous event of an univerſal reſurrection, if we ſhould throw it back for a million of years into the ever but never dying periods of eternity. And if we conſider this collegiate head as a reformer of morals, in conjunction with his adopted brother Prieſtley he has given to the profligate and licentious part of mankind a comfortable aſſurance of remaining for an indeterminate time in an inſenſible ſtate, and of conſequence exempted from the puniſhment of

divine

divine juſtice. But the famous preſbyterian Mr. Bourn has done abundantly more for the wicked of every denomination, by promiſing them a ſimilar comfortable aſſurance, that after death they ſhall be graciouſly permitted to take one eternal nap of annihilation.

Secondly. One particular reaſon for paying an extraordinary compliment to this learned head, at the expence of other pious and equally learned prelates, was owing perhaps to ſome honorary notice which had been taken of him in the 68th page of the ſecond edition of the genteely ſneering Confeſſional; and it ſtands thus: "In a ſermon on the nature and end of death, and a curious appendix ſubjoined to the third edition of Conſiderations on the theory of religion, by the reverend, learned, and worthy Maſter of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, how many doctrines are defended, how many are not oppoſed, not becauſe they are to be found in the New Teſtament, but becauſe they are eſtabliſhed in a liturgy, or decided in an article?" ---

It

It is to be hoped, that if this polemical writer in any future time ſhall be diſpoſed to aſk any queſtions, relative to our liturgy and articles, he will come prepared to give a ſatisfactory anſwer; for want of which he has left us at an honeſt liberty to affirm, that they contain no doctrines or propoſitions but what are conſonant both to reaſon and ſcripture.

Thirdly. In a letter to this dignified head, containing ſome remarks on ſome paſſages of this pamphlet, entitled, Conſiderations on the propriety of requiring a ſubſcription to articles of faith, an odd chriſtian has given us the following odd turn of expreſſion and ſentiment which may be ſeen in an appendix to the ſeventh volume of the London Review for the preſent year 1778; and it is ſo odd a ~~thing~~ thing, bearing ſo great a ſimilitude to a few literary monſters, that every ſincere member and advocate of our eſtabliſhed church may be diſpoſed not to think a mention of it in this place unneceſſary or impertinent.

"It

"It appears very clear and evident, that Nebuchadnezzar (ſays this monſtrous divine) had as much right to ſet up a golden image and compel all his ſubjects to worſhip it, as any governors whatever even of the chriſtian religion have to make articles of faith, and eſtabliſh modes of worſhip, for which they have no warrant in Holy Scripture, and then puniſh men in any reſpect for refuſing compliance. Was I forced to bow down and worſhip a golden image, whether it was deſigned to repreſent ſome Deity or the chief magiſtrate himſelf, or to declare in a chriſtian congregation my unfeigned aſſent to the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England, I really believe I ſhould prefer doing the former." This is highly condemned for a groſs abſurdity in the good ſenſe and moderation of Mr. Kenrick; and indeed all ſuch writers can deſerve no better notice than that of contempt. Nor do I believe that this diſtinguiſhed chriſtian at the head of a college or of the church, to whom ſuch obſervations are addreſſed, can be diſ-

poſed

poſed to receive them as an agreeable and complimentary ſacrifice; however on this point I ſhall make the following brief animadverſion: That if the biſhops, in council with the other chriſtian legiſlators of this realm, have no warrant from the Holy Scriptures to eſtabliſh any particular forms of prayer, or modes of worſhip, what warrant, from the ſame Scriptures, have the diſſenting parſons of this realm to deliver every ſabbath-day any particular form of prayer, or mode of worſhip, to their reſpective congregations? For the prayers of our lutherans, calviniſts, and methodiſts, cannot be juſtly ſaid to be any more a part of the New Teſtament than the written prayers of our eſtabliſhed church.

Fourthly. When theſe primaries of oppoſition are diſpoſed to obſerve, that "If your lordſhips ſeriouſly reflect upon your late conduct, both with regard to the petitioning clergy and the proteſtant diſſenters, you cannot poſſibly think any one

can imagine that the part you have acted does you honour in the opinion of judicious and unprejudiced perſons; that they may venture to challenge, and do challenge the boldeſt and warmeſt of your advocates, to ſhew the conſiſtency of your conduct with what ought to be the diſtinguiſhing character of every truly proteſtant biſhop?" In a juſt reply let me aſk them the two following queſtions: Has any prelate directly and openly denied any of the primary doctrines of chriſtian theiſm, of chriſtianity and proteſtantiſm, which are particularly ſpecified in the articles? Did the majority of your lordſhips give any particular aſſurances to the petitioning clergy and to the proteſtant diſſenters at large, in the courſe of their petitioning, of favour and intereſt, which in open violation of veracity was afterwards withheld? And if theſe queſtions cannot, as moſt ſurely they cannot, be anſwered in the affirmative, what inconſiſtency of conduct can theſe profeſſed enemies of our eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment juſtly complain of, and of which

your

your lordſhips can be ſuppoſed to be conſcious? But, to make uſe of certain academical terms with which theſe diſſenters are not very converſant, when perſons of a ſimilar turn of doctrine ſhall occupy the oppoſite roſtrums of reſpondents and opponents, it is no wonder that any controverted queſtion ſhould be determined in favour of their own opinion and judgment.

Fifthly. It is very ſtrange, and yet, if we conſider that you critics have heads full of republican and preſbytery prejudices of education, it is not at all ſtrange, that you ſhould perpetually make uſe of ſuch words, terms, and phraſeologies, as, religious liberty, glorious cauſe, honour of chriſtianity, intereſt of truth, true and falſe proteſtant prelates, in a looſe, deſultory, and indeterminate ſenſe, by which means you are as perpetually keeping the main points of controverſy in a circle, which, becauſe it has no beginning, can have no end. And indeed you are the only literati

who ever claimed the privilege of making a pompous parade or a reſpectable appearance in the field of demonſtration, or of logic and philoſophy, without definitions and without axioms.

But to prevent your keeping things relative to proteſtantiſm any longer in a ſtate of chaos or confuſion I will undertake to inform you what is to be underſtood by a true proteſtant, from whence, without any extraordinary degrees of ſagaciouſneſs, you will be eaſily qualified to diſtinguiſh between true and falſe proteſtantiſm.

A true proteſtant then is one who may be juſtly ſaid to enter a proteſt againſt particular doctrines of the Romiſh Church, as particular reaſons for ſeparating himſelf from her religious communion. And we will give you credit for underſtanding enough to read and enumerate them, as in our thirty-nine articles they are particularly ſpecified. And we now challenge you, in behalf of all our Engliſh, Lutheran and Calviniſtical

Calviniſtical diſſidents, to give other reaſons for this ſeparation than our eſtabliſhed and reformed Church of England has clearly exhibited. Nor is it unneceſſary, in this place, to inform you of another particular, of which you ſeem to be utterly ignorant: That, by the excellent biſhops Jewell and Sandys, our Church was not reformed directly and immediately upon any lutheran or calviniſtical plan, though, as chriſtians, in ſome of the fundamental doctrines of chriſtianity they muſt be ſuppoſed to agree with theſe antecedent reformers. This fact is evident from the following paſſage of Biſhop Jewel's Apology: *Nunc duo tantum nomina Lutherus et Zuinglius. Ut quoniam illi duo de re aliqua nondum conſentiunt, idcirco utrumque erraſſe, neutrum habuiſſe Evangelium, neutrum vere et recte docuiſſe, arbitremur.* And in another part of his Apology we read, *Cum in mediis illis tenebris exoriri primum cœpiſſet et lucere radius aliquis ignotæ tum et inauditæ, veritatis, cum Martinus Lutherus et Huldericus Zuinglius, præſtantiſſimi viri, et ad illuſtran-*

dum

dum orbem terrarum a Deo dati.— The only principal reformiſts from the Romiſh Church, of whom this great man has left an honourable record are, Luther and Zuinglius, for the name of Calvin is not mentioned. So that when Waterland, Hoadly, Burnet, Sykes, and ſome other eminent divines, in a particular point of controverſy, talk of interpreting a few paſſages in our articles in an auſtenian or calviniſtical ſenſe, nothing can be more abſurd or ridiculous; for if it is neceſſary to make an adoption of particular names, it would be abundantly nearer the truth to ſay, that they ſhould be interpreted in a ſenſe which ſhall be no diſcredit to a Sandys or a Jewel. But however this has been, is, or ſhall be the caſe, I will venture to affirm, that every religious doctrinal propoſition in the articles, if we ſhall deal fairly with them, as we do with Horace, Virgil, Homer, or any claſſical author, may be interpreted, even according to a literal conſtruction of words, in a ſenſe which is agreeable to the common experiences

riences of nature, and to the revealed will of God. Though I cannot leave theſe ſelf-confident critics without a ſomewhat longer converſe with them as arians and public abettors of licentiouſneſs.

Firſt. You are not afraid or aſhamed, to make uſe of your own words, to profeſs yourſelves members of an heretic and arian conventicle. And as prejudiced diſciples of the old Arrius let me give you this information, of which you are in lamentable want, that if we reject the divinity of Chriſt the whole plan or ſyſtem of religion, as revealed in the evangelic and epiſtolary writings of the New Teſtament, is a rank impropriety and impoſition, being ill adapted to anſwer the great end of our redemption from the natural and juſt puniſhment of ſin, diſobedience, and rebellion, for which it was graciouſly deſigned. You ſeem utterly ignorant alſo of this great and fundamental truth of chriſtianity, that the two particular ends to be obtained by the goſpel religion, were an extirpation

of

of idolatry and the redemption of mankind through the divine merits and interceſſion of Chriſt. And taking it for granted, as it is every where throughout the ſacred writings of the NewTeſtament, that every man is a ſinner, and of conſequence a rebel againſt the ſovereign will and authority of his God, we firſt of all proceed to argue with you thus, in proof of our bleſſed Saviour's divinity, from the reaſon and nature of things. In a matter of inſult, indignity, or offence, which ſhall be ſuppoſed to be given by a ſubject to a king, no other ſubject (if we conſider him in the point of inequality with a king) could, without the higheſt impertinence or impropriety, think of offering any terms of reconciliation and a future acceptance; but, conſidering all three in the equality of manhood, one man may interpoſe between two others without any impropriety of deſign and addreſs upon the occaſion. I have already and juſtly obſerved, that it muſt be conſidered as one of the chief corner ſtones of our chriſtian fabric, that

every

every man muſt be a ſinner and a rebel againſt the laws, the perſon, and majeſty of his God. To make uſe therefore of Shakeſpeare's words *(a dread of ſomething after death)* in the character and reflections of a ſinner; *(there's the rub)* and indeed it has been, is, and will be, a rub to every pious, ſober, and conſiderate perſon, in all ages of the world. And we are clearly taught in the Holy Scriptures of the New Teſtament, that this rub ſhall be entirely removed by a right faith, and a ſincere repentance, through the divine merits and mediation of Chriſt. But, if you reject the divinity of Chriſt, he muſt as a man have had more than enough to aſk for himſelf. Nor as a creature could he entertain the thought of offering to act the part of a mediator between God and himſelf and of all other fellow-creatures, without an imputation of the higheſt arrogance and blaſphemy. Nor is it conſiſtent with our ideas of the infinite and eternal dignity of God to give to the moſt perfect of created beings any encouragement or invitation to act in

this exalted office of a mediator. And there is one circumſtance more of the higheſt importance, that no creature can be allowed to be a competent judge of what ſatisfaction or atonement infinite juſtice, preſerving the dignity of perſon and government, could accept. So that if we reject the divinity of Chriſt, the whole plan or ſyſtem of chriſtianity, which has an immediate connection with the doctrines of ſatisfaction, atonement, with a ſacrifice and propitiation for ſin, by a right faith and a ſincere repentance through the divine merits and interceſſion of Chriſt; if, I ſay, we reject the divinity of Chriſt, the whole plan or ſyſtem of religion, as delivered in the evangelic and epiſtolary writings of the New Teſtament, muſt be conſidered as a rank impropriety and impoſition. Thus far we have argued in proof of our Saviour's divinity from the reaſon and nature of things.

Secondly. Let us give you another argument in proof of our Saviour's divinity, and

and it ſtands clearly and briefly thus: The word *manhood* can be applied to nothing more than man, and the word *godhead* can be aſcribed to nothing leſs than God; but the word *godhead* (for St. Paul ſays, that in him dwelleth the fullneſs of the godhead) is aſcribed to Chriſt. So that in oppoſition to theſe profeſſed abettors of arianiſm, we leave the meaneſt adept in the ſchools of logic and philoſophy to draw the conſequence naturally deducible from this ſcriptural poſition.

Thirdly. That three different and diſtinct perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, do exiſt in one eternal immenſe ſpiritual nature, body, or ſubſtance, is the doctrine of our chriſtian trinity, as delivered and believed by the moſt pious and judicious divines in every age of the chriſtian church. That this doctrine is ſo myſterious as to be incomprehenſible by human underſtandings, I readily allow; but then I do affirm, that we aſſent to matters of fact in the natural world which are equally ſtrange and un-

accountable. And if you will read one of the beſt reaſoned books in any language, which is entitled, The analogy of religion, natural and revealed, by Joſeph Butler, who was Biſhop of Briſtol, and died Biſhop of Durham, all difficulties or objections relative to the trinity will be eaſily removed and vaniſh.

Fourthly. You ſay, That the wiſeſt and beſt of men, which any country can boaſt of, may be produced in ſupport of the whiſtonian doctrine of groſs arianiſm; but the argument of authority, which muſt depend upon number and ability, is evidently againſt your ſide of the queſtion: For Euſebius, Biſhop of Cæſarean Paleſtine, and Alexander, Biſhop of Alexandria, who were members of the grand council of Nice, upon the firſt eſtabliſhment of chriſtianity under Conſtantine. That the Biſhops Sandys and Jewel, with the learned and judicious Hooker, who were the firſt eſtabliſhers and ſupporters of the proteſtant and reformed Church of England,

England, that Waterland, Stanhope, and Sherlocke, are, in reſpect to the argument of authority, of ſufficient weight to turn the ſcale of diſſention and controverſy.

Fifthly. Let us here freely obſerve, with a good deſign to cure your unorthodox diſtemper of arian infidelity, that the truth of theſe particular expreſſions in the Nicene Creed, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one ſubſtance with the Father; and that theſe of the Athanaſian Creed, The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghoſt eternal, or that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God, and yet there are not three eternals, but one eternal, nor three Gods, but one God; theſe expreſſions, I ſay, or propoſitions, both in the Nicene and Athanaſian Creeds, are plain and intelligible in themſelves, and do as evidently flow from this doctrine of the bleſſed trinity, that there are three diſtinct perſons in one eternal nature or ſubſtance, as any ſeries of

effects

effects from their real and natural cauſes. Nor ought the Athanaſian Creed to be rejected becauſe it is introduced with ſaying, Whoever will be ſaved, it is neceſſary that he hold the catholic faith; for when the expreſſion, *to be ſaved*, is applied ſolely to faith, without regard to things of a moral concernment, it muſt be taken in a limited ſenſe, and not in that ſenſe in which it is declared by our bleſſed Saviour, That the wicked ſhall go away into everlaſting puniſhment, but the righteous into life eternal. For the expreſſion, *to be ſaved*, in a ſole application to faith may be underſtood to ſignify, that whoever will avoid the crime of rejecting a doctrine which makes a part of an allowed divine revelation, or whoever will think rightly and truly, or juſtly and worthily of this doctrine of our chriſtian trinity, it is neceſſary to hold this catholic faith, of which in the Athanaſian Creed we have a particular deſcription.

Sixthly. Why the bleſſed Jeſus ſhould command his diſciples, after his reſurrection,

rection, to go and baptize all nations in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. Why he vouchſafed to expreſs himſelf to the Jews in terms which implied an equality with God the Father. Why he declared by his own inherent power to raiſe others and his own whole humanity from the dead, ſuſpending all the powers of nature, for which nothing leſs than omnipotence itſelf was ſufficient. Why it ſhould be agreeable to the will of God to accept of Chriſt's ſacrifice upon the croſs, as a full ſatisfaction, atonement, and propitiation, for ſin. Why he ſhould condeſcend to promiſe pardon and acceptance to all truly believing and repenting ſinners through the merits, interceſſion, and mediation only of Chriſt. This one thing I am ſure of, that it is a moſt deſirable and comfortable doctrine; but I cannot think myſelf at liberty to aſk a reaſon for all this of the almighty governor of the univerſe, without offering the higheſt inſult or indignity to his goodneſs, wiſdom, and juſtice: To his goodneſs for offering

theſe

theſe conditions of reconciliation, his mercy for acceptance, and to his juſtice for declaring the ſacrifice of Chriſt to be a perfect ſatisfaction.

Seventhly. By every plan of reformation which has hitherto appeared, it is propoſed, in every form of prayer, to exclude the merits, interceſſion, and mediation of Chriſt: So that now the true reaſon of your lordſhips having been charged with the want of a ſupreme regard for the honour of chriſtianity and the intereſt of truth, is accidentally indulged with an emigration at large; becauſe your lordſhips will not reſolve, in violence to the determinations of private opinion and judgment, to ſupport what theſe eminent critics call the glorious cauſe, or the honour and intereſt of chriſtianity, by a rejection of Chriſt's divinity, or by diſhonouring him, whom, in regard to the preſent and future view of religion, you muſt think it both your duty and intereſt to honour.

Eighthly.

Eighthly. Since in point of the higheſt human abilities, you critics claim the merit and privilege of giving learning and criticiſm to all Europe, no ſenſible man can imagine but you muſt be conſcious that your cry for reformation deſerves no greater regard than that of children; ſo that the Church of England can have no more important buſineſs upon her hands at preſent, than that of looking out for ſome rattle which ſhall pleaſe you both. And though the great reading Mr. Jortin is in no ſmall reputation with the members of your conventicle fraternity, yet I think he may be ſaid to have given you an handſome drubbing in the following pertinent obſervation, which may be read in the twentieth page of his Preface to his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory: "When (ſays he) they have railed, wrangled, declaimed, preached, and written againſt one another, they will at laſt ſit down and be quiet in very wearineſs."

I have determined to have ſome argument with theſe renowned critics, but

more pretendedly renowned divines, upon the ſubject of licentiouſneſs, becauſe it will give birth to a few reflections and hiſtorical matters of fact, which your lordſhips may think worthy a particular attention, as neceſſary to the ſupport of our eccleſiaſtical and civil eſtabliſhments.

I. The Monthly Reviewers, with the whole body of proteſtant diſſenters, may be ſaid to be fully repreſented at preſent, and to have been ſo for many years paſt, by a logarithmetical Price, and a chymerical Prieſley, who are the perpetual ſitting members of our diſſenting congreſs.

Firſt. Licentiouſneſs may be juſtly ſaid to be a contradiction to the determinations of legiſlation, with a libellous attack on private and public character; it may be compared alſo to the ſelling of prohibited goods without a licenſe; both which circumſtances of behaviour are condemned and made puniſhable by the wholeſome laws of every diſtinct and civil government.

II.

II. It is the principal deſign and buſineſs of modern licentiouſneſs, to repreſent the ſupreme civil magiſtrate, and all other gentlemen who exiſt in the particular and moſt exalted offices of adminiſtration, in the moſt offenſive and odious view; by which means out of every ſubject's mind are extirpated the natural paſſions of love and fear, with every motive to duty and obedience, which muſt be the only natural cement of all human ſocieties; for there muſt be a determining power ſomewhere, and a ready obedience muſt be paid to it, otherwiſe how can theſe licentious critics account for the exiſtence of any ſuch thing as government within the reſpective boundaries of a private or public family.

Secondly. Licentiouſneſs will again moſt effectually and ſelf injuriouſly expoſe itſelf, as they relate, to the welfare both of Church and State, in the two following inſtances.

When the legiſlative authority of this realm had declared the Americans to be in

a ſtate of rebellion, one Price was permitted to write a book, in which, in a comparative view of the moral and literary deſerts of the inhabitants of America and of Great-Britain, he gives the preference to the former, and obſerves, that they are more deſerving of the higheſt honours, dignity, and emoluments of government, than any on whom they are legally conferred in this our mixed monarchial ſtate of royalty: This was not only one of the higheſt poſſible inſults to the determining powers of legiſlation, but to his country at large; and, in any other part of the globe, inſtead of being honoured with a freedom and a gold box, it had been juſtly compenſated with an halter or a dungeon. In this book it is alſo rebelliouſly written, that the Americans are, and ought to be, diſpoſed to ſacrifice their heart's blood, rather than live in a ſtate of ſubjection to the legiſlative authority of this realm; but to a cool-headed politician what is the great difference between the heart, head, or finger blood of an American. And whatever

opinion

opinion ſome people may be inclined to entertain of this man's recondite erudition, he is abundantly more adroit in the unprofitable buſineſs of rhapſody and enthuſiaſm, than in the uſeful arts of ſound reaſoning and juſt philoſophy.

In the next place, the doctrine of the bleſſed trinity is ſanctioned and eſtabliſhed by the legiſlative authority. So that whoever ſhall publiſh a book, in which our bleſſed Saviour's divinity is expreſſly denied, and in which it is alſo peremptorily declared to have no ſanction from the Holy Scriptures, is guilty of a licentiouſneſs, which is made puniſhable by an eſtabliſhed ordinance of government. And when any diſſenting or monthly reviewing arian ſhall hereafter take up his puritaniſm, which is not inferior in wonderful atchievements to infallibility itſelf, and ſhall impiouſly affirm, as did the old Will Whiſton, that Jeſus Chriſt was a mere man, the ſon of Joſeph and Mary, in the ſame manner as he was the natural product of a male and female

Whiſton,

Whiſton; ſince nineteen out of twenty amongſt the diſſenters do not qualify according to law, an Archbiſhop of Canterbury, in a neceſſary and juſt reſentment, ſhould receive informations, and ſuffer the law to be executed with ſeverity; and not to do ſo is an unjuſtifiable puſillanimity. And on this point let me here inform our Jebbite and Lindſeyan abettors of groſs arianiſm, that three divine perſons in one ſpiritual, immenſe, and eternal nature, can make but one ſpiritual, immenſe, and eternal God: So that to charge the trinitarian church of England with a tritheiſtical ſpecies of idolatry, is manifeſtly untrue; becauſe this our chriſtian doctrine of the bleſſed trinity is evidently and perfectly conſiſtent with the unity of theiſm. And whoever will read what the almoſt unparalelled, towering, and Shakeſpeare genius of the great Biſhop Beveridge has written in proof of the ſcriptural rectitude of our trinitarian faith, will be eaſily inclined to hold the doctrine of old Arius in no higher eſteem than the noſtrum of a quack,

quack, or a fable of the bees. Nature indeed declares, and therefore it muſt be true, that atheiſts, deiſts, and arians, muſt and can be determined by nothing elſe than by private opinion and judgment, and have a right to a protection of perſon and property, whilſt they behave as peaceable and dutiful ſubjects: Yet ſtill, if the rights and privileges, liberty and powers, of legiſlation ſhall be allowed an exiſtence, theſe gentry have no right from or in nature to any ſettled and particular places of religious convention and to public ſchools in a chriſtian country, and within the bounds of an eſtabliſhed trinitarian church; nor can they have a right to publiſh and propagate their ſentiments in a ſpirit of infallibility, declaring every diſſentient to be abſolutely in the wrong, that their arguments carry with them an irreſiſtible conviction, and of conſequence, that theiſts, chriſtians, and trinitarians, muſt be wilful and unconſcientious ſacrificers of the intereſt of truth.

Thirdly.

III. There is another ſpecies of licentiouſneſs, highly deſerving our notice, which is continually ſheltering itſelf under the banners of the word *toleration*.

Firſt. It is of great importance to obſerve, that the word *toleration* implieth no other acts of favour and indulgence to the profeſſed enemies of our eccleſiaſtical and civil conſtitutions, than what good polity, founded on the ſuggeſtions of prudence in the ſupreme civil magiſtrate, ſhall vouchſafe to diſpenſe. On this point let us conſult the determinations of divine wiſdom or polity, on which alone we can depend, with the higheſt confidence or abſolute infallibility.

When it pleaſed the almighty governor of the univerſe to eſtabliſh the true religion or doctrines of monotheiſm amongſt the Jews, in oppoſition to the falſe religion of idolatry, all inter-marriages between the Jews and Idolaters were peremptorily forbidden, and the religion of idolatry was declared

an

an object of intoleration. It being a divine maxim, that a falſe religion ought to be openly oppoſed and contradicted by a true one, but that a true religion ought not to be openly oppoſed and contradicted by a falſe one. And with this divine maxim how the very ſenſible and Iriſh puritanic Wilton could imagine, that chriſtians might innocently incorporate the worſhip of the falſe gods of idolatry with our chriſtian monotheiſm, is ſomething, though no myſtery, which is ſtrange and unaccountable.

Secondly. Upon the reſtoration, when republicaniſm with her ſelf-directed or extempore-preaching fanatics and enthuſiaſts had been removed and ſilenced, in the wiſdom, prudence, or good polity of legiſlation, to people of this wrongly political and religious caſt, all religious conventicles, conventions, and aſſemblies, upon a ſabbath-day, were abſolutely forbidden, upon a preſumption that they would be improved into machinations and conſpi-

racies againſt the perſon of royalty, and a mixed mornarchial government; but in proceſs of time, upon certain conditions too well known to need any particular recital, they were allowed to purchaſe an epiſcopal licenſe for conventicles, in which they were permitted to celebrate a ſabbath in their own extempore and unknown modes of prayer and adoration. And from hence the famous Mr. Prieſtley has taken the aſſurance to affirm, that the tolerated religion of our Engliſh chriſtian diſſidents ought to be conſidered as a part of our eſtabliſhed religion; but if mohammediſm and popery ſhould be tolerated, as they may be in our preſent impolitical fits of toleration, he might with equal propriety declare that theſe alſo made a part of our eſtabliſhed religion: And he has fallen into this blunder for want of recollecting that every eſtabliſhed religion is a tolerated one, but that a tolerated religion is not an eſtabliſhed one.

Thirdly. In a folio edition of the works of the great Mr. Locke, we have three letters

letters on toleration. The firſt was imported into England in a Latin dreſs; it had the good fortune to ſtrike the great Mr. Locke, and induced him to honour it with an Engliſh tranſlation. In all probability it was originally written by ſome lutheran, or calviniſtical Dutch divine. When objections to this piece of foreign divinity had been made by a few of our moſt eminent churchmen, Mr. Locke, by two letters on toleration, particularly and heartily engaged in its defence, endeavouring to prove the reaſonableneſs of an univerſal toleration, a point which this lutheran or calviniſtical Dutch divine never intended to illuſtrate and inſiſt upon; nor do our lutheran and calviniſtical diſſidents in England, at this time, contend for any other free and unreſtrained religion, than that of preſbytery. And I ſhall only obſerve at preſent, that amongſt the multifarious compoſitions of this great man, he has no where thrown out ſo many objectionable and ill-reaſoned points; or has no where diſcovered ſuch palpable imbecillities of a fallible judgment.

Fourthly. If a ſpirit of univerſal charity in every diſtinct government ſhould be deliberating and reſolve upon an univerſal toleration, and upon diſpenſing to every man without diſtinction the common franchiſes of free born ſubjects, it muſt deſerve the approbation and encouragement of every good chriſtian, who is animated by a true ſcriptural love of the whole human ſpecies without reſpect of perſon or country; but if the governors of one particular nation ſhould grant indulgencies which are denied by all others of a differently religious and political turn, this is not juſtifiable by any rules of good polity, either human or divine: For though we are divinely commanded to love our enemies, yet to put a ſword into an enemy's hand, with a deſign to have it employed for our immediate deſtruction, can be no more the voice of a good and ſaving God, than of common ſenſe and prudence.

Fifthly. The two natural and principal enemies of our civil and eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments

eſtabliſhments are the whole body of diſſenters, or republicans and catholics. And let us put the two following queſtions, in which royalty and its immediate deſcendents are moſt materially intereſted: Whenever a revolution blow ſhall be given in favour of catholics, is it probable that they will think a proteſtant prince a proper guardian and defender of the faith? And when the intereſt of republicaniſm ſhall be predominant, is it poſſible that any king ſhould be an object of its election? For agreeable to the recorded experiences of all hiſtory, the temporary anarchial vengeance of a revolution tempeſt has been always wrecked upon thoſe who exiſt upon the ſpot of higheſt eminence and dignity; agreeable to this old latin proverb, *Aut rex aut nullus*. In confirmation of this proverb, even the author of the Confeſſional, in his reflections on the fate of the petition, obſerves, that men of conſcience (paying a particular compliment to republicans and preſbyters) when become the majority, will riſe up in a formidable body

body againſt the eſtabliſhment; and we may juſtly add, in the deſtruction of a king, and in the perpetual baniſhment of liberty and toleration. Nor can ſuch an open declaration fail of deſerving every one's ſerious regard, who is a ſincere friend to the civil and eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments of this realm. So much at preſent on the ſubject of toleration, either limited or univerſal.

Sixthly. Concerning licentiouſneſs, it is a well known matter of fact, that for more than thirty years a ſet of men, who, upon civil and religious motives, have been avowed enemies of our eſtabliſhments both in church and ſtate, have been permitted to circulate throughout the kingdom a lunary publication, in which the determinations of parliament have been generally reprobated and vilified, and in which have been made a moſt rude and libellous attack on the private and public character of gentlemen in every ſucceeding adminiſtration; nor, beſides this, did they fail

fail for ſeveral ſucceeding months, whilſt the American cauſe was moſt warmly eſpouſed by an ill-judged patriotiſm, to defend the inſurging and rebellious deſigns of our American ſubjects for independency: And even to ſhew their zeal for what they call the glorious cauſe of liberty or rebellion, every thing publiſhed in defence of the determinations of the miniſtry and the parliament, was either concealed or reprobated; but every thing which to a cool-headed politician muſt appear groſſly inſolent and defamatory, was honoured with the epithets of manly, generous, and liberal. Nor has their conduct in the diſtinct province of religion been leſs remarkably culpable; openly declaring, in a manner diſcreditable to the meaneſt capacity, that our eſtabliſhed mode of public worſhip, approved and ratified by the divines of a legal convocation and ſenate, muſt be conſidered as an impoſition on what they have ſtupidly called the liberty of private judgment and conſcience; whereas the practice of extempore prayer and preaching in undigeſted and

unconnected

unconnected modes of fanatical evomition has been pronounced moſt agreeable to the true ſpirit and liberty of the goſpel; and even the divinity of Chriſt has been impiouſly treated with a levity becoming only the nature of a fable, or a romance. This has no parallel, and it is pity that it ſhould have in any civilized nation throughout the globe.

Seventhly. A few gentlemen, in moſt exalted ſtations, aware of the ill conſequences which muſt attend this uncounteracted and libelling licentiouſneſs, engaged a new ſet of literati of prime abilities, who have too much good ſenſe and moderation to adopt the abſurd maxims of modern patriotiſm, that every one out of power muſt be in the right, but every one in power muſt be in the wrong; that the meaſures of adminiſtration, and the judgment of a majority, muſt be oppoſed at all adventures. So that Mr. Kenrick and his confederates do every where pay all becoming deference to the authority and

determinations

determinations of legal ſuperiors. And ſince two ſets of learned men are not neceſſary to execute the ſame plan, no ſincere friend to the eſtabliſhments of his country can reſolve to encourage this licentious publication of partial and bigotted republicans. Nor can a continuance of ſuch an unreaſonable and illegal freedom fail of producing a timidity in political departments, which will prevent the determinations of legiſlation from being executed with that vigour or ſteadineſs of reſolution which is neceſſary for our public preſervation and defence: And, in matters of religion, this licentiouſneſs naturally tends to weaken that influence on the minds of men, which the repeated inſtructions of revelation ought to have in ſupport of the important cauſes of virtue and theiſm. In a common newspaper I lately met with this notorious inſtance of Engliſh liberty, patriotiſm, or licentiouſneſs, "A wicked, timid, and contemptible miniſtry." Now the king muſt be a member of the preſent and of every ſucceeding adminiſtration; nor to live

in a continual ſtate of libellous inſult from the ſubjects at large, is it leſs reaſonable in itſelf than injurious to the dignity of government. And every friend of liberty, but hater of licentiouſneſs, would wiſh to ſee a tribunal of Roman cenſorſhip erected in this kingdom, by which all news-papers, books, and pamphlets, ſhould be examined, and every libellous attack on character, or inſultive contradiction to the determinations of legiſlation, ſhould be puniſhed with ſeverity; for though the brave and generous Romans diſputed with and oppoſed one another in public ſenate, yet they wiſely reſolved not to permit ſubjects at large libellouſly to traduce the character of gentlemen who were honoured with an exaltation to the higheſt offices both in church and ſtate.

Having here taken a ſhort view of the no reaſoning and unjuſtifiable methods by which our civil and eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhments, and even their proper and immediate guardians, have been attacked, leaving

your

your lordſhips to take ſuch meaſures for the prevention and puniſhment of them as your ſuperior judgment ſhall ſuggeſt, and which, in your legiſlative capacity, you ſhall have opportunities to recommend and ratify; I ſhall conclude this addreſs with the following obſervations on the manner in which I have conſidered and repreſented our thirty-nine articles as conſonant both to reaſon and ſcripture; and indeed it would be very ſtrange, ſince they were compiled by the two cool-headed and ſound reaſoning divines, Jewel and Sandys, if they could not be thus eaſily and naturally interpreted.

Firſt. I have read the two famous expoſitions of our articles, which were written by the two great divines, Beveridge and Burnet. In their mode of explanation every article may juſtly be conſidered as the ſubject of a theme or a declamation; ſo that all their obſervations cannot be ſuppoſed to have an immediate connection with one or more doctrinal propoſitions

which are contained in every ſeparate article. And the moſt valuable part of what Dr. Bennet has written upon the articles was deſigned to prove their original authenticity, and indeed what he has advanced upon this point carries with it an irreſiſtible evidence; and I have endeavoured to make a proper uſe of it, in anſwer to particular objections thrown out by the author of the Confeſſional, which he himſelf never underſtood, nor are they well authenticated.

Secondly. Biſhop Beveridge's expoſition is in my opinion by much the moſt valuable, he being moſt judicious in the buſineſs of important quotation, pertinent in application, and moſt ſatisfactory in his concluſions; and even in other parts of his compoſitions he may juſtly be ſaid to be equally uncommon and ſtriking in his ſentiment and language in the character of a divine, as Shakeſpeare was in that of a tragœdian. Nor will it be eſteemed impertinent, perhaps, by the generality of readers, to be informed that one Mr. Richard Smith,

bookſeller,

bookſeller, in London, upon the death of this great man, purchaſed all his works of his executor; an expoſition only upon thirty articles were to be found in his ſtudy, though he had treated of the other nine in the ſame manner; but this part of his expoſition being in other hands, Mr. Smith, though much pains were taken for doing ſo, could not procure it for publication.

Thirdly. The method which I have adopted for repreſenting the doctrinal propoſitions of our articles, according to a literal conſtruction of words in which they are expreſſed, as agreeable to the judgment of reaſon or of common ſenſe, and to the plain documents of revelation, has been hitherto unattempted. It may be judged particularly uſeful to every young gentleman deſigned for the miniſtry, and perhaps the moſt adult divine will read it with inſtructiveneſs and pleaſure.

If this work ſhall have the good fortune to merit your lordſhips approbation and public

public recommendation, and of conſequence with a proper encouragement from the clergy in general, another volume is intended, in which will be proved a ſtrong ſimilitude between the reformed and eſtabliſhed chriſtian churches under the Emperor Conſtantine and Queen Elizabeth. What great genius', not inferior to any in the preſent age, preſided in the grand council of Nice. That many things relative to the life of Conſtantine, in the character of a divine, deſerve a much more honourable name than that of ſuperſtition, with which by our lutheran and calviniſtical diſſidents they are conſtantly reprobated. That by making a proper diſtinction between the doctrines which ariſe from figurative, metaphorical, and allegorical expreſſions, and theſe which admit of a literal interpretation, we ſhall eaſily and moſt naturally account for the corrupt doctrines, practices, and ſuperſtitions of popery, for the erroneous opinions and unreaſonable demands of our Zuinglian diſciples; and in the reſult of this inquiry it will be ſatisfactorily proved

to

to the moſt impartial and judicious part of mankind, that the reformed and eſtabliſhed Church of England is neareſt the truth in Jeſus, or in preference to any other, is moſt conſonant to that particular ſyſtem of religion which is revealed in the evangelic and epiſtolary writings of the New Teſtament.

This from one who is a ſincere friend to our eccleſiaſtical and civil eſtabliſhments, and from one who lives in a due eſteem of your lordſhips virtues, public character, and abilities,

A Defence

THE

INTRODUCTION.

I Can eaſily conceive that ſome religious eſtabliſhment may be founded on the plain truths and documents of the Goſpel Revelation; ſo that if the articles, principles or inſtitutions, of ſuch a religious eſtabliſhment ſhould be regularly and conſcientiouſly practiſed, it would neceſſarily promote the honour of God, and the univerſal good of mankind. Not to allow the poſſibility of ſuch a one amounts to nothing leſs than this abſurd affirmation, that Jeſus Chriſt came into the world not to reveal any important truths, or make any diſcoveries of the will of God, which, if properly ſyſtematized by the improved reaſon and underſtandings of men, can help us to any happy regulation and government of all human ſocieties. The poſſibility of ſuch an eſtabliſhment being allowed, it will be my principal buſineſs to prove, that this of the Church of England is directly calculated to anſwer ſo great and glorious a deſign. And

it may eaſily be done, to the intire ſatisfaction of every intelligent reader, who is but tolerably well verſed in ſuch materials of reaſoning as the logician and philoſopher are ſuppoſed to make uſe of in their reſpective provinces of argumentation. Since the grand objections which have been thrown out in a late and continued controverſy againſt the diſcipline and particular modes of public worſhip, ſanctioned by the legiſlative authority of this realm, and which conſtitute the eſtabliſhed Church of England, are collected together in an anonymous book, called The Confeſſional; *and ſince they have been urged in the acuteneſs of a* platonic ſophiſt *and a* Demoſthenian orator, *in a more extenſive and dangerous view than I believe the greateſt part of a petitioning clergy have been apprehenſive; for theſe objections, though uſhered into the world with a ſpecious pretence only to make a few alterations in the ſuperſtructure-apartments of our church, yet a full attention to human nature will give good reaſon to ſuſpect, that even the foundation itſelf was intended to be overthrown. This able anonymous writer, whom I ſhall occaſionally call the* Confeſſional, *in the ſneering pleaſantry of a Greek ſophiſt, has proved, though not in the full extent of deſign, ſatanically miſchievous; and though, by a ſuperior*

ſuperior ſtrength of argument, no change of ſentiment may be wrought upon a calviniſtically ſtiff-necked, diſobedient, and gainſaying people; yet I hope it may have a favourable influence on many of his unwary and deluded converts. In a concealment of his name no harm is done, nor do I think it worth while to inquire after it; being well aſſured, that names, though they always have, and will have an undue influence on vulgar underſtandings, ought not to determine the abilities of an author, nor the merit of his performance.

It will not be judged amiſs, perhaps, to give ſome account of the Confeſſional's *religious and uncharitable turn of ſentiment; and to make ſome remarks on it before I proceed to prove the inſufficiency of objections in general, and of the* Confeſſional's *in particular, being fully ſatisfied that I have to do with an adverſary who is abundantly more artful than ſolid. Even from a frank declaration of his own oddities and perverſe ſingularities of religious ſentiment, ever ſince his having grown up to years of a rational maturity, his intellectual ſyſtem has been enlarging, and reared with certain abſceſſes of contradiction; which declare him not to be a member of any eſtabliſhed church, or*

diſſenting conventicle, in the whole extent of Chriſtendom. And though the doctrine of the trinity has been believed, and defended by far the greateſt number of divines, even of the firſt-rate ability, in every antient and modern age of chriſtianity; yet ſo long as the bulk of chriſtians ſhall reſolve to pray for temporal bleſſings and ſpiritual graces, even in the moſt ſolemn addreſſes of piety and devotion to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt, if we abſtractedly conſider the religion of Chriſt *and* Mohammed, *under the natural operation of theſe rearing abſceſſes of ſingularity, he is inclined to give the preference to Mohammediſm. Nor in this place can I help adding one circumſtance more, which muſt be infinitely diſcreditable to any thing, which can be called good ſenſe and underſtanding, or to politeneſs and univerſal Charity. That the clergy, tho' a conſiderable number, have not only been eminent for abilities to defend the reformed religion, but conſpicuous alſo for virtue and piety, are every where repreſented as influenced in all the concerns of morality and religion, by no other principle than that of the moſt mean, ſordid, and ſelfiſh view, to the emoluments of eccleſiaſtical preferment. So that no examined, ſettled, and habitual belief, that a conſcientious diſcharge of their miniſterial duties*

(as

(as preſcribed by the eſtabliſhed Church of England) will give them opportunities of ſerving God and Man in the moſt acceptable manner; and, in conſequence of it, of being both happy here and hereafter; no ſuch examined and ſettled belief, I ſay, is allowed to have any influence on a clerical mind. But to preſerve the credit (tho' it is a credit of a ſtrange nature) of an impartial miſanthropy, lay gentlemen, in every department of civil adminiſtrations, are treated in a manner equally uncharitable and ungracious. For in a book called "Reflections on the fate of the Petition;" in an arbitrary ſpirit of an Oliverian enthuſiaſt, he impudently obſerves, that no King, no Sir Robert Walpole, or Lord North, in particular, nor any gentlemen (Oliverians and Republicans excepted) who have been invited to ſerve their King and Country, are allowed to be influenced in their political deſigns by any love of their Country, nor by any ſincere and commendable reſolution to promote the public intereſt and welfare of ſociety at large; but all the obligations of duty and intereſt, or of virtue and principle, are ſwallowed up in ſome unnatural and fixed intentions to trample on the liberties of the ſubject, and in a meer ſordid view to certain great emoluments, which every diſtinct government muſt appoint, as rewards of their daily care, attendance, and ſervices. And indeed the word emolument occurs ſo often in the ſingular,

or

or plural number, as to be extremely nauſeous to every ſenſible man, who has no ſcruples about the innocency of deſiring ſuch a ſhare of temporalities, as is neceſſary to ſupport his particular rank in the ſeveral provinces of clerical inſtruction and civil authority. In this puritanic and vehement turn of mind, in common with the ancient puritans of Queen Elizabeth's reign, it is glaringly obvious, that, as republicans and diſſenters, both he and his compurgatorial monthly reviewers are forward to join any ſet, or party of men, without any regard to virtue, principle, or religion; with a deſign to throw things into a ſtate of rebellionary confuſion and, if it is poſſible, to overturn our eccleſiaſtical and civil eſtabliſhments.

Whoever has read, or ſhall have an opportunity of reading, the learned and judicious Hooker, on eccleſiaſtical polity, will plainly ſee, that not a ſingle objection has been thrown out by the Confeſſional, *and by other adverſaries of our eſtabliſhed church, but what was urged in Queen Elizabeth's reign, and have been all particularly conſidered and ſatisfactorily anſwered by that great man, in the full abilities of an excellent ſcholar, a learned divine, and ſound logician. So that I do not take objections from this* Confeſſional *for the ſake of novelty, but becauſe it has been much read, and has met with a favourable reception amongſt diſſenters*

of

of every denomination. And indeed, in one view, to do it juſtice, it may be ſaid that it is one of the beſt written pieces of puritaniſm which is any where extant in the Engliſh tongue. And it may juſtly be ſaid, alſo, to be one of the worſt reaſoned books which was ever held in any eſteem in the literary world. For inſtead of arguing like a ſound logician by clear definitions, apt poſitions, and by conſequences naturally deducible from them, he has artfully attempted to do his work by figurative and metaphorical expreſſions, by confident affirmations, falſe repreſentations, and by perpetually mixing the moſt important religious doctrines, about which there is not, and never was any diſpute, with other points of perpetual ſceptiſm, and doubtful diſputation. Nor does he ever fail to give a plauſibility to the moſt nugatory objections, under the pleaſing and attractive influences of genteel ſneering, which evidently runs through the whole performance. So that his free, rude, illiberal, and inſolent treatment of the moſt reſpectable characters and perſonages in the univerſal province of literature, juſtly entitles him to every ſpecies of raillery and ſatyrical repreſentation which genius can invent, and language can delineate.

From this account of the nature, ſtrength, and ability of this Confeſſional *adverſary, who has*

has quoted ſome hundreds of authors on diſputable points of divinity; nor have the other two profeſſions of law and phyſick fewer objects of ambiguity and diſpute. But to conclude from diſputable points in different profeſſions, that there is nothing plain, clear, fixed, and ſettled, which the ſenſible divine, lawyer, or phyſician, can heartily believe, and uniformly practice, is an argument of a weak mind and a bad heart; both which are glaringly exhibited in this champion of religious liberty, not to receive any doctrines of faith, nor conform to any modes of public worſhip which the chriſtian governors of any chriſtian country ſhall enforce and ordain, as agreeable to the plain documents of the goſpel Revelation. I ſhall therefore now proceed to examine the ſeveral reaſons, arguments, and objections, which have been thrown out by proteſtant diſſenting adverſaries of this ſelf-confident and unhappy turn to juſtify themſelves for ſeparating, not only from the eſtabliſhed church of Rome, but from a religious communion with the proteſtant and eſtabliſhed church of England. And my plan of defending our religious eſtabliſhment is not calculated to anſwer the temporary objections of a day or a month, but for a more durable and continued ſupport, in imitation of the great Hooker in his eccleſiaſtical polity, and how I have proved ſucceſsful in the execution, is ſubmitted to the judgment of the public.

A DEFENCE,

A

DEFENCE,

&c.

CHAPTER I.

IN the beginning of the Confeſſional we have a few detached and independent propoſitions united into one, and exhibited as a reaſon to juſtify every ſpecies of antient and modern diſſenters for ſeparating themſelves from a religious communion with the eſtabliſhed churches of Rome and of England. The propoſition is this:---Jeſus Chriſt hath, by his goſpel, called all men unto liberty, the glorious liberty of the Children of God; and reſtored them to the privilege of working out their own ſalvation by their own underſtandings and endeavours. For this, or for the work of ſalvation, ſuf-

ficient means are afforded in the holy ſcriptures, without having recourſe to the doctrines and commandments of men. In theſe, or in the ſcriptures, all things needful for ſpiritual living, and man's ſoul's health, are mentioned and ſhewed. Faith and conſcience have no dependence upon man's laws, and are not to be compelled by man's authority, and none other hath the church of Rome to ſhew for the ſpiritual dominion ſhe claimeth. The church of Chriſt is congregated by the word of God, and not by man's law. The king's laws are not to be obeyed any farther than they agree with the law of God.* *Firſt,*

* I do not conſider the ſeveral parts of this ſtrange propoſition as objects of the Confeſſional's own capufacture or invention, though he ſeems to put in for ſome merit in throwing them together in the order in which they have been in this place particularly expoſed. Nor were they deſigned, as he obſerves, (for the greateſt part of his book is founded on miſtakes and miſrepreſentations) with a ſole view to juſtify the Diſſenters ſeparation from the church of Rome; nor can the ſeveral parts of this propoſition be objections any more againſt the church of Rome than the church of England. But in fact, the ſeveral parts of this propoſition had been urged by the antient puritans in Queen Elizabeth's reign as arguments againſt the eſtabliſhed diſcipline, doctrines, and authority of our epiſcopal conſtitution. Let us, therefore, take to pieces this ſkeleton, or old leaven of calviniſtical, or what the great biſhop Jewel would call Zuinglian ſayings, and enquire if they can afford any reaſonable objection to the eſtabliſhed diſcipline and modes of public worſhip, which by the legiſlative authority of this realm have been ſanctioned and ratified.

Firſt, Jeſus Chriſt, ſay the antient and modern puritans, hath in his goſpel, called all men unto liberty, the glorious liberty of the children of God. This is one of the moſt high-ſeaſoned figurative, or metaphorical expreſſions, which is any where to be found in the whole epiſtolary writings of St. Paul; and to explain it requires more common ſenſe, judgment, and attention to St. Paul's figurative method of writing, than from the ſtiffneſs and unintelligibleneſs of this his grand propoſition, there is any reaſon to think he is poſſeſſed of. And I am ſorry to obſerve that liberty, glorious liberty of the ſons of God, true freedom, the liberties of proteſtantiſm, or of a Proteſtant church, and the liberties alſo of our conſtitution, are words and phraſes which this puritan, and our monthly ſcribes frequently make uſe of without any clear, ſettled, and adequate ideas, and properly fall under Mr. Locke's imperfection and abuſe of words. The conſequences of which in our preſent political and religious controverſies are unhappy and lamentable. And I may add alſo, that theſe words and phraſes may be compared to a noſe of wax, which is craftily turned towards the face of religion, in ſuch directions and attitudes, as appear calculated to

throw an undiſtinguiſhing ſhade on the ſides of ignorance and hypocriſy. So that proteſtants had no reaſon originally to have withdrawn from the communion of the church of Rome, becauſe that church ever did readily allow that Jeſus Chriſt hath by his goſpel called all men unto liberty, the glorious liberty of the children of God, nor upon this account can our proteſtant diſſenters have reaſon to withdraw from the communion of the eſtabliſhed church of England.

Secondly, That Jeſus Chriſt by his goſpel hath reſtored men to the privilege of working out their own ſalvation by their own underſtandings and endeavours. That every one has a privilege of working out his own ſalvation by his own underſtanding and endeavours, is a propoſition which hath been allowed ſelf-evident by the ſerious and conſiderate part of mankind in every civilized age and country; even before the time of our ſaviour's coming into the world, and even at this time is allowed to be a religious maxim in China and Turky, as well as in Scotland or Geneva; nor, can this, therefore, be any good reaſon why diſſenting proteſtants have withdrawn from the communion of the eſtabliſhed churches of Rome and of England.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, It is true, and ſo far well and wiſely ſaid by the Confeſſional in this complex propoſition, that for the work of ſalvation ſufficient means are afforded in the holy ſcriptures without having recourſe to the doctrines and commandments of men. The church of England does, and always has allowed, that for the work of ſalvation ſufficient means are afforded in the holy ſcriptures, but, notwithſtanding, I ſuppoſe that no diſſenter, who hath juſt pretenſions to the character of a ſenſible man, will deny but that recourſe may be had, or that a proper regard and obedience may be paid to the doctrines and commandments of the chriſtian civil magiſtrate in matters of faith and public worſhip, when their doctrines and commandments are not apparently repugnant to reaſon and the holy ſcriptures. And why, therefore, ſhould any ſet of chriſtians withdraw from the communion of the eſtabliſhed church of England, putting on the hideous garb of heretics and ſchiſmatics, when there is not any pretence for a contrariety of religious faith and ſentiment?

Fourthly, This puritan ſays, that in the holy ſcriptures all things needful for ſpiritual living and man's ſoul's health are mentioned

mentioned and ſhewed, conſequently faith and practice, having no dependance upon man's laws, are not to be compelled by man's authority. And none other hath the Church of Rome to ſhew for the ſpiritual dominion ſhe claimeth.

With regard to ſpiritual living and man's ſoul's health, it is amazing to me that a genius ſo refined and capable of expreſſing himſelf in terms of ſenſibility and education, ſhould chooſe to make uſe of a language, becoming only the untutored mind of handicrafts and ſilly women.

That in the holy ſcriptures then, all things needful for ſpiritual living and man's ſoul's health are mentioned and ſhewed, is a propoſition which even the Papiſts themſelves readily allow; nor do I know that the Church of England in her articles and canons, nor in her particular and occaſional modes of public worſhip, hath any where contradicted. In the next place, that the faith and conſcience of one man, can have no dependance on the faith and conſcience of another, or on man's laws, is likewiſe no object of controverſy; but that the faith and conſcience of any particular perſon was never proved to be

in

in the wrong by the religious inſtructions of Chriſt and his holy Apoſtles; or that the faith and conſcience of no particular perſon were never altered, improved, or enlightened by the religious inſtructions, ſcriptural interpretations, and doctrines even of unapoſtolical men, in the character of liberally educated and learned divines, is a matter of fact, which by this ſenſible Puritan cannot be ſincerely and heartily denied.

Fifthly. The Church of Chriſt is congregated by the word of God, and not by Man's law.

This, ſurely, is a moſt ſtiff and unintelligible propoſition, and at the ſame time unmeaning, as intended to give a reaſon for the diſſenters obſerving a ſabbath, different from what is ſuppoſed to be given by the eſtabliſhed Church of England. We may juſtly be ſaid to celebrate a ſabbath in obedience to the word of God, and to Man's law, or in obedience to the will of God, both under the law and the goſpel: And if the Calviniſtical or Lutheran diſſenters of this kingdom have any other reaſon for doing ſo, it is beſt known to themſelves; nor is it worth the Church of England's while to inquire after it. *Sixthly.*

Sixthly. Nor are the King's laws to be any further obeyed, than as they agree with the laws of God.

There was no occaſion to ſay, that the King's laws, in things relative to public worſhip, are not to be any farther obeyed than as they agree with the laws of God, becauſe the diſſenters, in matters of religious concernment, are determined not to obey the King's laws in any inſtance at all. For, by the King's law, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, are appointed to be read as parts of public worſhip: And tho' the diſſenters have not perverſeneſs enough to ſay that theſe parts of our public worſhip are contrary to the law of God, yet, in almoſt all their conventicles, they have nothing to do with the Lord's Prayer, and theſe Ten Commandments. Nor would I be ſuppoſed to mention this in the way of Confeſſional raillery, but as a real matter of fact.

Having thus examined the ſeveral parts of this ſtrange propoſition, conſidered as objections which have been occaſionally thrown out by antient and modern puritans, I defy any ſenſible man, who is the leaſt given to contemplation and a free inquiry,

inquiry, to extract any reaſon from it, which can juſtify the making a diviſion in this our eſtabliſhed Church of Chriſt and of God. For reaſons of civil polity it is a point deſirable, beſides the conſideration of its being agreeable to the will of God, that all the ſubjects of every ſeparate chriſtian country ſhould conform to ſome certain rules of religious diſcipline and public worſhip, which her legal chriſtian governors ſhall recommend, approve, and inſtitute. So that, according to my judgment, no chriſtian in matters of religion, can reſiſt the ordinance of his chriſtian, legal, and civil magiſtrate, when nothing unreaſonable and unſcriptural is required to be believed and done, without reſiſting, at the ſame time, the ordinance of God; nor, n natural conſequence, without being guilty alſo of the ſcriptural offences of hereſy and ſchiſm. Let us, therefore, in the next place analyſe a few objections which have been thrown out by the Confeſſional in his own way, and partly upon his own authority; nor could any one but a determined rebel againſt every inſtitute of eccleſiaſtical and civil polity, have vomited them forth in ſuch a malignant and defamatory manner, as in the beginning of this book they are particularly exhibited. I ſay in the

moſt defamatory manner, becauſe they not only contradict all matter of fact, experience, and the general opinion of mankind, but are highly injurious to the moſt virtuous and literate characters.

In the firſt paragraph, (for in the beginning of a book moſt writers chooſe to inform their readers of the particular deſign of their undertaking) he obſerves, that the love of religious liberty is ſtill warm and vigorous in the hearts of a conſiderable number of the good people of England, notwithſtanding the various attempts of intereſted and irreligious men, in theſe latter, as well as in former times, to check and diſcourage it; and notwithſtanding the deſponding apprehenſions of ſome good men, that theſe ſtiflers had well nigh ſucceeded in their unrighteous attempts.

Now the meaning of this paragraph, as containing objections, againſt the eſtabliſhed Church of England, is evidently this: That the Arch-biſhops and Biſhops, with all the ſenſible and learned divines of our church, who diſſent from the Confeſſional in matters of religious liberty, cannot be animated with any warm and vigorous love of religious liberty, and of conſequence,

ſequence muſt be his, the very intereſted and irreligious men, whom he calls Stiflers; and who are charged with the damnable crime of unrighteouſly attempting to check and diſcourage the revealed truths and liberties of the Goſpel Religion. The charge indeed is an heavy one; and, if it was true, it would be a ſufficient reaſon for deſerting a Church, the ignorance of whoſe principal ſupporters ſhould be no leſs enormous, than their unrighteous deſigns to check all truth in nature, and to diſcourage all liberty of private opinion. But that ſuch great, learned, and good men, are his very intereſted and irreligious men; that they deſerve to be eſteemed ſtiflers and unrighteous attempters, to check and diſcourage the revealed truths and liberties of the Goſpel Religion, is a propoſition, perhaps, which may be pronounced good ſenſe at the Old Jewry, but it certainly will, and ought to be declared vile ſtuff on the conſecrated grounds of Weſtminſter and St. Paul's; and give me leave to tell ſuch a Bull, or Popiſh-dictator, in a puritanic dreſs, that the Archbiſhops and Biſhops, with other learned and pious divines of the Church of England, are animated by a lively ſenſe of God, and of their indiſpenſible obligations to promote univerſal righ-

teouſneſs and peace, which implieth ſomething infinitely more valuable than his religious and myſterious liberty; which, however great were his genius and ability, he never had honeſty enough to explain. The objection, we ſee, is without an argument, and of conſequence it muſt be diſmiſſed without an anſwer, it coming up exactly to what has been already hinted, that I have to do with an adverſary who is very abundant in inſolence and cunning, but extremely deficient in charity and judgment.

Let us hear him again in the two following paragraphs, and inquire if he can ſpeak in the language of a philoſopher or a logician.

Second Paragraph.— It now appears, that a little plain reaſoning, illuſtrated by a few indiſputable facts in favour of this invaluable legacy of our proteſtant anceſtors, hath been ſufficient to engage the attention of many well wiſhers to its preſervation and perpetuity, who, perhaps, might not otherwiſe have been aware of the preſent importance of ſuch a diſquiſition; but who, by having their obſervations turned upon the artful and indirect methods that have been taken by ſome of its inſi-

duous

duous adverſaries, under the maſk of friendſhip, to diminiſh its eſtimation, may, by the bleſſing of God, be excited to a greater degree of vigilance, that this fountain of all true piety and evangelical virtue, may never more be choaked up with the rubbiſh of traditional formalities.

Under the falſe title of an objection to the eſtabliſhed Church of England, this genius talks of having received an invaluable legacy from his proteſtant anceſtors, that it is a fountain of true piety and evangelical virtue, and that it has been choaked up by the Church of England with the rubbiſh of traditional formalities.

REMARKS.

Now, as a proteſtant, I thought myſelf equally entitled to a ſhare of this invaluable legacy, as well as he and the reſt of his proteſtant brethren; but knowing the pride of his heart, that this invaluable legacy (and indeed valuable it is) was bequeathed by the puritanic proteſtant anceſtors of Queen Elizabeth's reign, who were profeſſed enemies to the Queen, to her eſtabliſhed religion on true proteſtant principles, and were factious diſturbers of the general peace and tranquility of her government;

ment; I lay no claim to any part of this legacy, but freely conſent to give him the whole.

If this extraordinary and ſophiſtical genius had ſaid, that the New Teſtament is a fountain of true piety and evangelical virtue, which had been corrupted by the Church of England, with the rubbiſh of traditional formalities; this indeed had been a very intelligible, though a very falſe propoſition: But to talk of a legacy, left by the puritanic proteſtant anceſtors of Queen Elizabeth's reign, being a fountain of true piety and evangelical virtue, cannot be allowed to have either ſenſe or meaning, unleſs we ſuppoſe the divines of the Church of England to be papiſts, whom he ſhall charge with maintaining, that tradition is more to be regarded than the New Teſtament itſelf. Beſides, what idea can a ſenſible man, who is willing to have clear and adequate ideas of things, form of a traditional formality?— Or what idea can a ſenſible man have of the rubbiſh of traditional formalities, with which the Church of England is declared to have wilfully choaked their puritanic legacy, which is artfully called a fountain of true piety and evangelical virtue?

Third

Third Paragraph.—In this third paragraph, which is the concluſion of all his rhetorical and unreaſoned objections, it is ſaid, that good fortune has been had in hunting after, and making, this valuable diſcovery; and, indeed, if any ſuch diſcovery has been made, it may juſtly be ſaid to be more owing to fortune than to judgment. The valuable diſcovery is this, that encroachments on religious liberty, in proteſtant communities, by whatever ſpecious pretences they are introduced, can never be defended upon proteſtant principles.*

To

* In the firſt place, What is liberty? This learned puritan does not pretend to know what is chriſtian liberty. It is ſomething, of which he has no where given, nor has attempted to give any definition; and, therefore, how ſhall the Church of England know when ſhe hath made encroachments on this chriſtian liberty, which, conſidered as a legacy, has been given by Chriſt and his Apoſtles to all chriſtian ſocieties? For this legacy, given to us by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, I eſteem of infinitely greater conſequence than that which the Confeſſional boaſts of having received from his puritanic proteſtant anceſtors. And whatever diſcovery this writer pretends to have made in the Holy Land, and whatever merit he ſhall claim to himſelf upon this account, it was well known, and long before he was born had been made uſe of both by Jews and Mahommedans. For the Jew has ſaid, that no encroachments on Moſaic liberty was defenſible upon jewiſh principles; and the Mahommedan has declared, that no encroachments on his religious liberty is defenſible upon Mahommedan principles; all which amounts to what is equal to this pretendedly new diſcovery

To all ſuch objections, as are founded on arbitrary aſſertions, that the Church of England has choaked a legacy of proteſtant anceſtors with the rubbiſh of traditional formalities; that no encroachments on proteſtant chriſtian liberties are defenſible on proteſtant chriſtian principles; that the hearts of the divines of our eſtabliſhed church, are deſtitute of any warm and vigorous

diſcovery in the chriſtian world, that no encroachments on proteſtant chriſtian liberty is defenſible on proteſtant chriſtian principles; a ſelf-evident propoſition, which no Divine of the Church of England was ever abſurd enough to deny or contradict. But this cruel adverſary, who is determined to give no quarter to the Church of England's religious eſtabliſhment, has a reſerved corps of diſſenting guards, who are reſolved to do us an injury by an unnatural conſequence to be drawn from this ſelf-evident propoſition; which the propoſition itſelf is utterly incapaciated to do. And thus artfully, though in a manner unwarrantable by all the rules of true logic, they proceed to reaſon. That becauſe no encroachments on proteſtant chriſtian liberty is defenſible upon proteſtant chriſtian principles, therefore the Articles, Creeds and Canons of the Church of England, to demand a ſolemn aſſent to the being and perfections of God; to the divinity of Chriſt and of the Holy Ghoſt; to our Saviour's incarnation, crucifixion, reſurrection, and aſcenſion; to the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation's being contrary to reaſon and ſcripture, is an encroachment on every proteſtant chriſtian's liberty: At the conſequences of complying every puritan muſt turn pale and ſhudder. If an Euclid, Plato, Tully, or if a Clarke, Tillotſon, or Stanhope, could be permitted to hear this untutored Logician drawing conſequences from a ſelf-evident inſtead of a demonſtrated propoſition, they would be diſpoſed to laugh and hiſs him out of every academical ſchool, with the utmoſt indignation and contempt.

vigorous love of religious liberty; that our Archbiſhops and Biſhops are intereſted and irreligious men, ſtiflers, and unrighteous attempters to ſuppreſs a propagation of truth and liberty: — To all ſuch objections, I ſay, as are what I call metaphorically, obſcure, rhetorically invidious, of a bigotted and enthuſiaſtic turn, no anſwers are neceſſary, which require the uſe of any ſuch materials of argumentation as have been univerſally practiſed in the ſchools of logic and philoſophy. I ſhall therefore proceed to examine other objections which are more plain in nature, and intelligible in deſcription, and which have been principally intended to prove the unreaſonableneſs and inefficiency of a ſubſcription. The moſt formidable objections, then, of this kind, which have been urged by the Confeſſional, and by the adverſaries of our eſtabliſhed Church at large, are theſe,

Firſt, That the Church has no right to determine controverſies of Faith, or to eſtabliſh any particular modes of public worſhip, which, upon chriſtian principles, ſhall be conſcientiouſly judged moſt acceptable to Almighty God, for whoſe immediate honour and ſervice it is intended.

Secondly, That all the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England have no literal or grammatical ſenſe in which they can be underſtood, but will admit of different ſenſes, meanings, conſtructions, and interpretations, which are repugnant to reaſon and ſcripture, and have an immoral tendency.

Thirdly, That the church's ſenſe of the articles, and that of the articles themſelves, diſagree from each other; that the compiler and deſign of the articles is not evident; and that it was the view of the King's declaration, which is annexed to the articles, to keep things in a ſtate of uncertainty.

Fourthly, That the deſign of the articles, which is ſaid to have been intended to prevent a diverſity of opinion, is abſurd; becauſe the thing propoſed to be done is impoſſible, and of conſequence impractiable.

Fifthly, That no ſuch things as articles, creeds, confeſſions, liturgies, formularies, ſyſtems, ought to be received into a chriſtian church, even though they contain no propoſitions but what are agreeable both to reaſon and ſcripture.

Some

Some of theſe objections, indeed, are important, plain in nature, and intelligible in deſcription; and allowing them to have probability and truth on their ſide, the unreaſonableneſs and inefficiency of a ſubſcription would be irreſiſtible. But I flatter myſelf with ability clearly to anſwer, and as ſatisfactorily to refute.

CHAPTER II.

OBJECTION.

THAT the Church has no right to determine controverſies, or to ſettle any particular doctrines of faith, nor to eſtabliſh any particular modes of public worſhip, which, upon chriſtian principles, ſhall be judged moſt acceptable to Almighty God, for whoſe immediate honour and ſervice it is intended.

Firſt, It is a peculiar misfortune in the Confeſſional, and in other adverſaries at large of our eſtabliſhed Church, to make uſe of words and terms, ſuch as the Church,

and the Church's ſenſe of the Articles, without giving any definition of them: In conſequence of which they go on from a beginning to the end of a book, and during an whole controverſy, deceiving themſelves, and impoſing upon their readers.

Let us, therefore, endeavour to aſcertain what is to be underſtood by the word Church; or who are the immediate and proper repreſentatives of it; and then, that the Church hath a right to determine controverſies of faith, will be a moſt plain and unexceptionable propoſition.

We muſt here inform our diſſenting opponents, for they do not ſeem ſufficiently aware of it, that in all countries, in which a ſtate has been eſtabliſhed, and a religion profeſſed, that the legal governors who have repreſented the ſtate, have been alſo allowed the proper and immediate repreſentatives of the Church. It being a well-known hiſtorical matter of fact, that amongſt the antient civilized Greeks and Romans, their modes of public worſhip were ſanctioned and ratified by the legiſlative authority of every particular ſtate: And let me here obſerve, that, as obvious to, and univerſally allowed by the common

ſenſe

ſenſe and reaſon of mankind, all maſters and governors of families, and of ſchools, that the major part of every community, or body of men, to whom caſes of reference have been made, and that the legal governors of every country, have a right to determine controverſies, in their reſpective provinces of determination and government. Nor without ſuch a right can any ſocieties of mankind poſſibly ſubſiſt. In matters of civil polity, legal governors, directed by conſci enceand judgment, and in oppoſition to all thoſe who ſhall be influenced by factious and rebellious motives, have a right to do what they pleaſe; or to enact any law which they ſhall think right, fit, reaſonable, and requiſite, for the ſecurity, peace, welfare, and good government of the ſtate. And in matters of eccleſiaſtical polity, in this our chriſtian ſtate, legal governors, in oppoſition to the opinion of Atheiſts and Idolaters, have a right to determine controverſies of faith, or to eſtabliſh certain doctrines of faith, and modes of public worſhip; and, in obedience to the revealed will of God, to provide for the miniſters of the goſpel by a tenth of temporalities. This being a definite meaſure, or proportion of things, which infinite wiſdom alone could ſpecify, and has peremptorily

remptorily determined. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, in the year 1562, after that the thirty-nine articles had been ſettled and agreed to in a clerical convocation, they were recommended to the Queen, Lords Temporal, and Commoners, in parliament aſſembled, to give them a parliamentary ratification. The Confeſſional, who is one of the moſt inſolent writers, and has no regard to truth, as it ſtands on the authority of reaſon and hiſtorical record, poſitively declares, that the deſign of compiling the articles is not evident. But the deſign of compiling the articles under the judgment of a Jewel, the moſt pious of men, and learned of divines, and eſpecially of the two firſt articles, in which the being and perfections of God, and the divinity of Chriſt, are particularly deſcribed, was ſo approveably conſpicuous, that the members of our public ſenate had no ſcruple about giving them a legiſlative ſanction; and of conſequence of enacting it into a law, that no one ſhould be admitted into the miniſtry of our proteſtant church, without declaring a ſolemn aſſent to articles ſo congenial to reaſon, and to the revealed documents of the Goſpel Religion. In this view and repreſentation of things, I hope this will be eſteemed a plain and unexceptionable

unexceptionable propoſition: That the legal chriſtian governors, of a chriſtian ſtate, have a right to determine controverſies of faith in the Church of Chriſt, and to eſtabliſh ſuch forms of public worſhip as the moſt improved reaſon and underſtandings of men are able to invent, and have authority to preſcribe.

Secondly, I ſhall here recite the beginning of the twentieth, and the latter part of the thirty-fourth articles, add a few obſervations, and then proceed to anſwer objections, made by Mr. Locke, Herport, and the Monthly Reviewers.

Thirdly, We will point out the difference of opinion and practice in Calviniſtical and Lutheran, or what the great Biſhop Jewel would call Zuinglian communities, as they differ from the eſtabliſhed Church of England: And then conſider how this right of determining controverſies of faith was exerciſed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and what conſequences are naturally deducible from it, as it will affect the reality or nullity of ſuch a power.

Firſt, In the twentieth article, it is ſaid, the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies

ceremonies, and authority in controverſies of faith. In the thirty-fourth, it is ſaid, every particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change, and aboliſh, ceremonies or rites of the church, ordained only by man's authority, ſo that all things be done to edifying.

OBSERVATIONS.

There are two kinds of churches and ſtates, viſible and inviſible, dead and living. As to the inviſible and dead ones, they can be no objects of our preſent controverſy, and, therefore, I ſhall leave them in their wonted ſtate, of an unintereſting repoſe. The words church and ſtate are what I call dead things, and can have no will or power to do any thing. But the living and intelligent, or the immediate and legal repreſentatives of the church and ſtate, or the chriſtian civil magiſtrate of every chriſtian country, may be juſtly ſaid to have, and exerciſe, a right to determine controverſies in matters of opinion and practice in the ſtate; and to determine controverſies alſo in matters of faith and public worſhip in the church: And I affirm, that the chriſtian civil magiſtrate hath a right to do ſo without acting repugnantly to reaſon or ſcripture.

OBJECTIONS.

Firſt, In Mr. Locke's tranſlation of the famous letter on toleration, which was originally imported into England in a latin dreſs, and was written, perhaps, by ſome Dutch, Lutheran, or Calviniſtical Divine, it is ſaid, that the power and rights of the civil magiſtrate extends only to the appointment and regulation of ſuch things as relate to the temporal concernments of perſon and property. And the grand reaſon alledged to ſupport the propoſition, is this: That the care of ſouls is not committed to the civil magiſtrate any more than to other men. It is not committed, ſays this letter writer, to him by God, becauſe it appears not that God has given any any ſuch authority to one man over another; nor can any ſuch power be veſted in the magiſtrate by the conſent of the people.

ANSWER.

Surely this Dutch, or German Divine, had never attentively conſidered that part of his bible which relates to what paſſed between God and Moſes, in things undeniably pertinent to the care and ſalvation of ſouls. It is very true, that a wiſe, prudent,

and atheiſtical civil magiſtrate can only think himſelf obliged to place able and judicious men in the ſeveral departments of civil judicature; and to enact penal laws, preſcribing fines, impriſonments, and even the puniſhment of death itſelf for capital offences againſt the eſtabliſhed laws of his government. And ſomething ſimilar may be ſaid of a wiſe, prudent, and atheiſtical maſter of a family; ſuch a one will only think himſelf obliged to provide meat, drink, and cloaths, for the immediate branches of his family; to diſcountenance and puniſh, according to the nature and extent of his family juriſdiction, all acts of oppreſſion and injuſtice, which ſhall be practiſed by one towards another. But a theiſtical civil magiſtrate, and a theiſtical maſter of a family, will think themſelves obliged to do ſomething more of a very different nature and tendency. Let me obſerve, alſo, in a plain matter of fact, that every civil magiſtrate, conſidered as a man, and a rational creature, muſt be a religious magiſtrate alſo: [and ſince he has a ſoul to be ſaved, and ſince every layman ought, and hath a right, to be a divine to himſelf, or to his own conſcience.] The civil and religious magiſtrate has one common intereſt in taking care not to eſtabliſh any modes of public

public worſhip, but ſuch as he ſhall judge to be apparently calculated upon the foundation of a true chriſtian faith and morality, to help him directly forward in his way to ſpiritual happineſs and ſalvation. And laſtly, we will allow, what is frequently obſerved by Mr. Locke in his own letters on toleration, that the power of the civil magiſtrate may be, and has been, exerciſed for the eſtabliſhment of idolatry, or of a falſe religion. But I hope this great man would not infer from hence, that, when it ſhall ſo happen, the power of the civil magiſtrate ought not to be employed in ſupport of a true religion, and for the eſtabliſhment of ſuch modes of public worſhip as ſhall be evidently agreeable to the documents of revelation.

OBJECTION II.

One Mr. Herport, no unlearned divine, and a well-meaning honeſt man, of the Lutheran profeſſion, at Berne, in Switzerland, whoſe perſecution and ſufferings upon diſſenting principles I ſhall hereafter give ſome account of; and whoſe book I ſhall examine, becauſe it is written upon the ſame plan with that of the Confeſſional; Mr. Herport, I ſay, hath obſerved upon this point, that controverſies of faith can

be determined only at the future tribunal of God. A long while to wait for it indeed. But, in my opinion, ſomething in this way ought to be done here in the viſible Church of Chriſt, as a means of preparing and qualifying them for that tremendous period of inquiry and determination.

OBJECTION III.

The Monthly Reviewers have wantonly aſſerted, that any number of diſſenting families have a right, by the plain documents of chriſtianity, to chooſe any perſon to be their miniſter. But the Holy Scriptures of the New Teſtament were never underſtood by theſe lunary ſcribes; and in matters of religion they may juſtly be ſaid to be lunatic ſcribes; becauſe, as Mr. Pope has obſerved of my Lord Bolingbroke, in things of religious concernment, they are rank triflers; nor during the whole controverſy have they produced any argument ſuperior to the fanciful pomp and ſuperſtition of a Ruſſian Exorciſt. In reply, therefore, to theſe champion abettors of diſſention, and to the unwarrantable demands of proteſtant diſſenters, let Chriſt himſelf, and the practice of the firſt three centuries, determine the controverſy.

Chriſt

Chriſt himſelf ſays to his immediate diſciples, "You have not choſen me, but I have choſen you;" *i. e.* You have not choſen me to be your ſpiritual lord, teacher, or paſtor; but I have choſen you, as perſons to whom I have communicated, and ſhall continue to communicate, divine inſtructions for your faith and practice, as providentially intended inſtruments of converting both jews and heathens (at that time, indeed, conſtituting the whole world) from the traditional ſuperſtitions of judaiſm, and from the ignorances, ſuperſtitions, falſehoods, and abominations, of idolatry, to a right faith and ſteady acknowledgment of the one true God and King, or of the true kingdom of Heaven.

Secondly, In anſwer to this unreaſonable demand of proteſtant diſſenters, that any ſet of chriſtian men have a right to appoint whomſoever they pleaſe for their miniſter, ſpiritual teacher, or paſtor, it is certain that no chriſtian ſociety ever claimed or exerciſed any right to appoint any ſpiritual teacher or paſtor, but ſuch as had been originally ordained and appointed by a power, originally delegated by Chriſt himſelf to his Apoſtles, and by a continuance of it in a regular ſucceſſion of ſpiritual teachers to the

the time of the Emperor Conſtantine: And ſince it is allowed, that Chriſt not only acted in the character of a prieſt and a prophet, but in that alſo of a king, his religious and kingly powers, therefore, would naturally devolve to, and be abſorbed in all chriſtian kings, princes, or civil magiſtrates, in their reſpective diſtinct provinces of temporal authority and dominion. This I hope will be judged ſufficient to anſwer theſe diſſenting genius's, who, for many years paſt, have been exerciſing, in the ſchools of a dogmatical religion, of factious and republican parties, all the popiſh powers of holineſs and infallibility, under a pretended abhorrence of popery and her appendant prerogatives.

Concerning the different method of determining controverſies of faith from that of the Church of England, as it has been practiſed by Lutherans and Calviniſts, we are informed by one of the moſt violent abettors of preſbytery, that the Calviniſts in Holland ſtrenuouſly inſiſted, that the Church, conſtituted as theirs was upon a republican model, had the ſole power of defining matters of faith, and of diſtinguiſhing between points neceſſary and unneceſſary; and they held, that the civil magiſtrate

magiſtrate was bound to enforce the Churches deciſions, and to diſcourage and ſuppreſs all ſects and hereſies contrary thereunto. They went farther ſtill; they held, that the civil magiſtrate who did not his duty in this province, ceaſed to be a child of God, and might be depoſed from his office: And ſome of them carried this matter ſo far, that upon ſome remiſſneſs in the ſtates to ſuppreſs what they called the enemies of God, a deputation had been ſent from the clergy to offer the ſovereignty of ſix of the ſeven United Provinces to Queen Elizabeth.†

We are preſented here with a truly puritanic and arbitrary method of determining controverſies of faith, indeed. And I believe that my Lord Chatham and Mr. Fox, as friends of religious liberty, were not apprized of their pleading the cauſe of puritans, who, if theſe great men ſhould ever have lived under the hotbrained influences of preſbytery, would attempt to uncommoner the one, and unlord the other, upon refuſing to give their part of a parliamentary ſanction to ſuch religious doctrines, as, according to the great Hooker, were called by the ancient puritans

† Conſeſſ. page 264.

tans rules of the Lord's diſcipline, and ordinances of the bleſſed Jeſus.‡

If we look down again upon the right of determining controverſies of faith, as it is practiſed

‡ This writer alſo obſerves, that King James the Firſt hated the puritans not for their doctrines, but for their diſlike to prelacy; however, he recollects himſelf, and in the length of two ſentences ſpeaks out the truth more plainly: For he ſays alſo, that the King imagined whoever was not a friend to epiſcopal power, muſt have the ſame objections to that of Kings. Now the whole truth is out, for King James hated both the puritan and his doctrines, becauſe he who had an averſion to every thing epiſcopal, extended it alſo to whatever ſavoured of royalty; and then he adds as a further enlargement of the whole truth, that King James was not much miſtaken with regard to his contemporary puritans. And I wiſh that I had better reaſons than I have at preſent, to believe that the King now upon the throne would meet with a leſs ſevere treatment, if modern puritans had full power, than was dealt out to an unhappy prince by the enthuſiaſts, under the command of a moſt conſummately hypocritical and flagitious Cromwell. This writer adds, there never was a period, from his firſt acceſſion to the Engliſh throne till the day of his death, when King James the Firſt would not make his divinity bend to his politics. There is a remarkable vein of impiety which runs through all this inſolent writer's animadverſions on private characters, by entering into the hearts of men with the ſame ſelf ſufficient eaſe and certainty of knowledge as is natural to expect from the eternal Omniſcient himſelf. Queen Elizabeth's ſucceſſor is repreſented, as moſt great men are, by this pretendedly infallible puritan, without religion or principle. But, however, though he was a vain man, yet he had his proper intervals of devotional ſerioufneſs; and, upon the whole, I have charity to think that he was a truly pious man, meant the good of his ſubjects, and the ſalvation of ſouls.

practiſed by diſſenting miniſters in their reſpective conventicle flocks or congregations, we ſhall find it exerciſed in greater peremptorineſs of deciſion than has been ever done by any of the regular ſucccеſſors to the papal chair. For to make uſe of ſhort words, they damn and ſave, they bleſs and curſe, by certain private arbitrary doctrines and opinions, which they as arbitrarily call the terms of Goſpel Salvation. Nor are the poor deluded people of theſe diſſenting communities permitted to know and to ſatisfy themſelves about the rectitude of thoſe terms, words, phraſes, ſentences and concatenations of things which are ſuppoſed to make a rational and an acceptable ſervice. But every injudicious and untutored perſon, thruſting himſelf into the dignity of a religious paſtor, pretends to an ability to inform and inſtruct mankind by extempore effuſions, in a manner equally ſenſible and divine as it was really done by the Apoſtles under the illuminating and unerring influences of inſpiration. And that every diſſenting miniſter is more than a pope, to his ſeperate congregation is evident, becauſe though all the addreſſed prayers of the Romiſh Church to the Virgin Mary, and to a rabble of ſaints, are of an idolatrous nature, a charge which has

been fixed in all times, on the Church of Rome by our moſt eminent divines; yet ſtill they are written and publiſhed, ſo that every Catholic may ſatisfy his own private judgment about the nature and tendency of ſuch prayers. I have read a Romiſh Maſs-book and many of the prayers which are made uſe of by the papiſts, and am fully perſuaded that their ſeveral forms of devotion which are addreſſed to God the Father, to God the Son, and to God the holy Ghoſt, diſcover ſuch ſtrong marks of genius of a rational and fervent devotion, that they may be read with pleaſure and admiration, and may be profitably uſed by the moſt ſenſible proteſtant. But the Lutheran and Calviniſt with every other ſpecies of diſſenting teachers keep their prayers ſhut up in their heads and their pockets till the very inſtant of delivering them to their reſpective audiences, and then are returned back to the ſame repoſitories of dulneſs, darkneſs and oblivion. Let us now, therefore, in the laſt place, make a few reflections on the right of determining controverſies of faith, as it was exerciſed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

1*ſt*. In the condition of worldly meaneſs, perſecution, and of almoſt an univerſal contempt,

contempt, in which it was the determination of infinite wiſdom that Chriſt ſhould appear in the world, and preach the doctrines of his new religion, he had no legiſlative authority to eſtabliſh any religious doctrines or modes of public worſhip. In his temporal circumſtances he could eſtabliſh no religion in the country of Judea nor in the Roman Empire, becauſe no religion can with propriety be ſaid to be eſtabliſhed without the ſanctions of a legiſlative authority. Chriſt himſelf could not regularly and conſtantly preach in the temples of idolatry, nor in the ſynagogues of judaiſm; being obliged, not through choice but neceſſity, to preach in the ſtreets and in the fields.

2dly. Chriſt or the Son of God, being, by a myſterious union of the divine and human nature both God and man, and of conſequence muſt poſſeſs all divine excellencies and perfections, had a right, amongſt his immediate diſciples and followers, to aſſume the titles of Lord and Maſter; in theſe exalted characters he demanded an eaſy aſſent to his doctrines, and a ready obedience to his inſtructions, how to behave for rendering their miniſtry moſt extenſively ſucceſsful throughout the world.

In the heavenly characters of Chriſt, the Meſſiah or the Son of God, who according to the predictions of antient prophets was to come into the world about that time, under the prodigious influence of miracles and a well grounded faith that he delivered the great truths and doctrines of infinite wiſdom itſelf, he claimed and exerciſed a right of determining all controverſies of faith with regard both to Jews and heathens. To the one he ſuperſeded and aboliſhed all the ſacrificial parts of the law; nor was any heathen to be admitted into the number of his diſciples, without firſt of all renouncing the exiſtence and power of his idolatrous Gods, and placing, in the room of them, a ſtedfaſt faith, truſt and confidence in the one true, living, ſpiritual and inviſible God and king of heaven, whoſe being and perfections are ſo juſtly and amiably deſcribed in the firſt article of our Church.

3*dly*. The Apoſtles when deprived of the bodily preſence of their Lord and Maſter, could only determine controverſies of faith, under the natural influence of miracles, and a ſettled faith in their chriſtian converts, that the form, manner, and words in which they delivered their religious doctrines

doctrines were dictated by the holy ſpirit of inſpiration.

To ſilence and ſuppreſs all contrary notions and opinions which ſhould be taken up and maintained by different ſects of chriſtians, they every where inſiſted upon the incarnation of Chriſt, his crucifixion, reſurrection and aſcenſion, his equality with God the father, becauſe in him dwelt all the fullneſs of the Godhead bodily, the neceſſity of two ſacraments, and of expecting a ſalvation of ſouls through the merits and interceſſion only of Chriſt by his own full and perfect ſacrifice and oblation of himſelf on the croſs, all which leading and moſt important doctrines of chriſtianity are moſt piouſly repreſented in our communion ſervice. Nor in any other way could Chriſt and his Apoſtles, in a ſtate of perſecution, determine controverſies of faith.

4*thly*. Dr. Middleton I think has clearly proved that the power of working miracles did actually ceaſe with the firſt and immediate diſciples of Chriſt. But it ſeems highly probable that the gift of inſpiration ſhould be continued to every miniſter of the goſpel in a right order and line

line of ſucceſſion, during the whole ſtate of perſecution to the time of the Emperor Conſtantine: when a new face of things muſt neceſſarily ariſe, and when the common buſineſs of religion and of public worſhip muſt circulate in a different channel, and when chriſtian emperours, kings and governours in their different ſeperate empires, kingdoms, and countries would give a legiſlative and univerſal ſanction to all the leading and important doctrines of the new religion of Chriſt, which Chriſt himſelf and his Apoſtles had no temporal power or authority to do. In the year 1562 controverſies of faith were determined by giving a parliamentary ſanction to the Thirty Nine Articles, and to certain forms of prayer, or of public worſhip as agreeable to reaſon and ſcripture, and as neceſſary for the moſt comely order of things, and a regular government of the viſible church of Chriſt. I have declared a ſolemn aſſent indeed to the twentieth and thirty fourth Articles, In which it is ſaid, that the church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controverſies of faith, and that every national church hath authority to ordain, change and aboliſh ceremonies or rites of the church, ordained only by man's authority, ſo that all things

things be done to edifying. Nor, in the decline of life, in the fulleſt ſtrength of contemplation and judgment, am I conſcious of having done any thing which to any good chriſtian can give the leaſt uneaſineſs of mind, or diſquietude of conſcience; becauſe having clearly determined what is to be underſtood by the church, a point which is kept as a profound myſtery from the beginning to the end of the confeſſional, and by all other adverſaries in the late controverſy, it is evident that the church hath a right to determine controverſies of faith without offering the leaſt violence to reaſon or ſcripture.

CHAPTER III.

THIS chapter will be particularly employed inconſidering the unreaſonableneſs of this ſecond objection againſt ſubſcribing the articles of our eſtabliſhed church, that they have no literal or grammatical ſenſe in which they can be underſtood; but will admit of different ſenſes, meanings and interpretations which are repugnant to reaſon and ſcripture, and have an immoral tendency.

1*ſt.* In

1*ſt*. In this confeſſional chaos of divinity, it is ſaid that the articles will not only admit of a two, but of a ten thouſand fold ſenſe, or as many ſenſes, as there are ſubſcribers at any one time in our eſtabliſhed church. An obſervation indeed which no doubt, muſt be eſteemed highly important and edifying to each individual divine, and to the whole body of divines at large. That ſome few of the articles will admit of a double ſenſe, is an opinion, however unreaſonable and abſurd, as I ſhall hereafter clearly and ſatisfactorily demonſtrate, which has ſome countenance from the religious and controverſial compoſitions of Dr. Nicholls, Bennet, Burnet, Waterland, Sykes, Clarke, and Hoadley. To reproach the articles then with containing unreaſonable and unſcriptural doctrines, and to reproach Dr. Nicholls alſo with a deficiency in ſuch degrees of ſenſe and underſtanding as ſhould be found in every reſpectable divine. He charges Dr. Nicholls alſo with aſſerting that the articles may be ſubcribed in any ſenſe the conſtruction of the words will fairly admit of. And in what ſenſe, let me aſk, muſt I underſtand the confeſſional, or any other human compoſition, but in that which the conſtruction of the words will fairly admit

admit of. So that this obſervation may be fairly diſmiſſed with the following line in Horace,

Parturiunt montes, naſcetur ridiculus mus.

In another place he charges Dr. Bennet with aſſerting that all the thirty nine articles may be taken in a ſenſe contrary to the natural import of the words in which they are expreſſed. Thus in page 142 we have the following odd obſervation, upon the Doctor's atchievements; ſays he, upon the thirty nine articles, he hath proved that the Church of England, has a particular ſenſe of her own upon every one of theſe articles, which ſenſe, according to the Doctor is ſometimes contrary to the natural import of the words. Now Dr. Bennet has no where given us ſuch an aſſertion. It is therefore a rank falſehood, and has been unhappily propagated in this jargonic ſyſtem of divinity with a diſquieting influence on the minds of a Lindſay, a Jebb, or of the petitioning clergy at large, and of all our republican diſſenters in general.

Secondly. It is of great conſequence, in the common courſe of our religious inquiries,

to give a particular attention to what in page 259 is declared in the following words. By an unaccountable reverſe of things, the men who are enamoured the moſt of Laud's political and hierarchial principles have contended with the utmoſt zeal againſt putting a double ſenſe on any of the articles. As for my own part, I do not think myſelf at all intereſted to inquire into any reverſe or perverſity of things, however unaccountable it ſhall happen to be. Nor am I at all concerned to inquire who were moſt enamoured of Arch Biſhop Laud's political and hierarchial principles. He was certainly a great, learned, honeſt, and pious man, notwithſtanding, (in common with the whole Calviniſtical and Lutheran tribe) his miſtaken notions on the point of univerſal liberty and toleration. And I profeſs to be one of this great man's diſciples in contending with the utmoſt zeal againſt putting a double ſenſe on any of the articles.

In obedience therefore to a royal declaration, which the confeſſional is every where beating like a bear with his peaſe bladders of raillery, and agreeable to the opinion of Archbiſhop Laud's diſciples, I ſhall proceed to prove, that the articles, like

like all other human compoſitions have a literal and grammatical ſenſe in which they may be underſtood and are eaſily intelligible.

Firſt. Has not a book called the Confeſſional ſome literal and grammatical ſenſe in which the true meaning of the author may be aſcertained? has not every book ſome literal and grammatical conſtruction of words in which it is to be interpreted? From a plain affirmative anſwer to theſe plain queſtions, it is evident that this objection to the reaſonableneſs of ſubſcribing to the 39 articles of our eſtabliſhed church, is a rank falſehood, or a contradiction to all matter of fact, experience, and to the common practice of every reader in his way to underſtanding any book which is ſuppoſed to be the immediate object of his attention.

I ſhall therefore produce a paſſage from the Confeſſional, from Horace, Virgil, and Homer, introducing an article between each of them, in which inſtances the ignorance, malice, or diſhoneſty of our opponents will be moſt effectually expoſed, by ſhewing that the book of articles has a literal and grammatical conſtruction of

words, phraſes, ſentences and propoſitions, in which, like all other books, it may be eaſily underſtood.

1. From this inſulting puritan who pretends to a right of riding in a triumphant chariot of puritaniſm, living on the ſpoils of all eſtabliſhments whether civil or religious, we have the following paragraph in the beginning of his book. That the love of religious liberty is ſtill warm and vigorous in the hearts of a conſiderable number of the good people of England, notwithſtanding the various attempts of intereſted and irreligious men, in theſe latter as well as in former times, to check and diſcourage it; and notwithſtanding the deſponding apprehenſions of ſome good men, that theſe ſtiflers had well nigh ſucceeded in their unrighteous attempts.

Now a literal and grammatical ſenſe of theſe words does naturally give birth to the following propoſition. That there is in the heart of this Confeſſional, and in a conſiderable number of the good people of England, but in that of the divines of the church of England in general there is no warm and vigorous love of religious liberty; and that the ſame unhappy divines are irreligious

irreligious and intereſted men, ſtiflers, and unrighteous attempters to check, diſcourage and ſuppreſs that kind of religious liberty which was conceded by Chriſt to his diſciples in the revealed and religious inſtructions of the Goſpel.

This is a new method of doing buſineſs in the way of argumentation, by wantonly throwing out confident and invidious aſſertions, which are calculated eaſily to give fire to vulgar and uncontemplating underſtandings.

But when puritans have once blaſphemouſly perſuaded themſelves that they are not as other men are, that they never did and cannot ſin, it is no wonder if they ſhould arrogantly aſſume to themſelves a knowledge which extends itſelf not only to the outward actions of men, but even to the ſecret intentions of the heart; and in conſequence of it they not only declare in all imaginable peremptorineſs that our articles of religion are repugnant to reaſon and ſcripture, but inſolently charge us alſo with the horrid crimes of hypocriſy and prevarication in ſubſcribing to, and in declaring certain articles of faith to be agreeable, believing at the ſame time that they

are

are contrary to the plain documents of revelation. But the church of England muſt learn to bear and to endure all things from ſuch unlogical and paſſionate heads, which, to borrow a new word from Mr. Toplady, pretend to do more buſineſs in a ſecond, in a poſitivity of arbitrary poſitions, than a ſound logician is able to do in an hour by the common intermediate proceſſes of philoſophical argumentation.

Let us now introduce the following words from the firſt article, appealing to every ſenſible man, if, fairly judging and honeſtly pronouncing in conſequence of it, they have not a literal and grammatical ſenſe, in which they may be underſtood with equal clearneſs as any which ſhall be produced from moſt eminent *authors* in the literary world.

In the greateſt ſtrength and propriety of expreſſion it is ſaid in the firſt article, there is one living and true God, everlaſting, without body, parts, and paſſions, of infinite power, wiſdom, and goodneſs, the maker and preſerver of all things, both viſible and inviſible. I ſhall here remark, that if this propoſition, when interpreted according to a royal declaration, in a literal

ral and grammatical ſenſe, is not allowed by our Confeſſional adverſaries to be truly deſcriptive of the one true God and Father of the Univerſe, whom they are ſuppoſed to acknowledge and adore; and if they declare it to be an object of ambiguity or diſpute in their religious conventicles, it muſt certainly exhibit a pretty exact meaſure of religious principles, as repugnant to the plaineſt truths and documents of chriſtianity.

2. We affirm, that the book of articles has one literal and grammatical ſenſe of interpretation in common with all other books; and ſince this Confeſſional Genius has aſſerted that they have no ſuch literal and grammatical ſenſe, and that they may be underſtood in a ſenſe contrary to the natural import of words, let us try if we can produce any parallel inſtance from Horace, Virgil, or Homer, we having a natural right to call upon him or on his compurgatorial friends, the Monthly Reviewers, to produce ſome parallel inſtance, in order to juſtify this arbitrary method of interpreting the articles.

In the fifth ode of Horace's third book,

Cælo Tonantem credidimus Jovem
Regnare;

which

which words I thus literally and grammatically interpret:--- It is univerſally believed by us Romans, that Jupiter, who occaſionally hurls his thunder through the aery regions, governs all things by an univerſal providence. And by paying a proper regard to a literal and grammatical conſtruction of words, it will be ſaid, perhaps, that we have done juſtice to the book and to its author.† And if we recite the words of the firſt propoſition in the ſixth article, which were intended to expreſs the ſufficiency of the Holy Scriptures to ſalvation, in a common grammatical ſenſe of interpretation, they will be found tobe equally intelligible as the words of a Roman poet, of the great Tillotſon, or of a judicious Clarke.

Thus we read in the ſixth article, that Holy Scripture containeth all things neceſſary to ſalvation; ſo that whatſoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it ſhould be believed as an article of the

† Whether any of the inſpired books of ſcripture had ever fallen into the hands of Horace it is not eaſy to determine. But in the Holy Scriptures the power of producing thunder is made an attribute of divinity: And thus we read in the book of pſalms, "It is the glorious God which maketh the thunder."

the faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to ſalvation. And if any one ſhall wantonly aſſert, that theſe words, in a literal interpretation of them, have an ambiguous aſpect, he muſt ſurely entitle himſelf to the imputation of a ſlow underſtanding, and a moſt perverſe temper of contradiction, being diſpoſed to affirm, that things are very different from what in the book of nature and truth they do really exiſt. Let us take another paſſage from Virgil's firſt Georgic, and try what is, and what is neceſſary to be done in a grammatical way of interpretation, if we would underſtand Virgil, or any human compoſition whatſoever.

Quid faciat lætas ſegetes, quo ſidere terram
Vertere.
Incipiam canere.

Theſe words I thus literally and grammatically tranſlate. I ſhall begin in the mode and language of poetry, to inform my readers what is neceſſary to be done for producing joyous crops of corn, and what is the moſt proper ſeaſon of the year for ploughing the ground; nor by a due attention to the literal ſenſe of the words can we fail of repreſenting the true ſenſe and

meaning of the author. Nor can we render the ſeventh article plainly intelligible in the Latin or French language, without making choice of ſuch Latin and French words as ſhall correſpond to the literal ſenſe of theſe in which the article is thus expreſſed.

Article 7th. The Old Teſtament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Teſtament everlaſting life is offered to mankind by Chriſt, who is the only mediator between God and Man; wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old fathers did look only for tranſitory promiſes. Although the Law given from God to Moſes, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind chriſtian men, nor the civil precepts thereof, ought of neceſſity to be received in any common wealth; yet, notwithſtanding, no chriſtian man whatſoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

How ſtupid and invidious therefore is it wantonly to aſſert, that this article has no literal and grammatical ſenſe of words in which it is eaſily intelligible, nor is clearly expreſſive of any particular propoſition, as by experience we find it verified in all good authors in every language.

Fourthly.

Fourthly. Let us try in the last instance by what rule we are to interpret the following words of Homer, in the beginning of his first book, where he intended to give his readers a plain account of the particular design of his poem, and which in different points of view is presented in every succeeding book of the Iliad.

Μηνιν αειδε θεα Πηληιαδεω Αχιλληος
Ουλομενην.

Mr. Pope has thus translated them:

Achilles' wrath to Greece, the direful spring
Of woes unnumber'd, Heav'nly Goddess sing.

And Mr. Pope by properly attending to the literal and grammatical sense of the word μηνιν, which signifieth wrath, anger, or resentment, and by paying also a proper regard to the literal sense of the word ουλομενην, which signifieth hurtful, destructive, or direful, has undoubtedly given us the true sense of his chaotic genius.† Nor in

† Dr. Newt. Edit. of Milton, p. 6th.

Lucian, says this great man, introduces the shade of Homer, as expressly declaring that he had no other reason for making use of the word μηνιν the first in his poem, but because it

imitation of Mr Pope's method of interpreting Homer can the eighth article fail of exhibiting a ſenſe equally obvious to the common ſenſe and reaſon of mankind.

Article 8th. The three Creeds, Nice Creed, Athanaſian Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apoſtles Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by moſt certain warrants of Holy Scripture. The Confeſſional indeed, the monthly reviewers, Lindſey and Jebb, may perform what magical tricks they pleaſe upon an Arian ſtage, and may confidently aſſert, that in their arbitrary and ſcholaſtic method of interpreting Holy Scripture they can honeſtly deprive the Son and Holy Ghoſt of an equality with God the Father; but confidently to aſſert that theſe words have no literal and grammatical conſtruction, in which they exhibit a plain and intelligible propoſition, juſtly entitles them to a ſuſpicion of not poſſeſſing any of the common ſenſes

it was the firſt that came into his head. And the Confeſſional obſerves, as it has been already hinted, that the meaning or great deſign of the compilers of our articles is not evident. But both theſe Genius's, in their different provinces of criticiſm, may be proved to have diſcovered the greateſt ignorance and impotency of judgment.

ſenſes of an human body, nor any of the common qualities of an human underſtanding. Nor can they play ſimilar tricks of private and unpopular interpretation with Homer, Horace, or Virgil, by conſtruing them in ſenſes different from and contrary to each other, without a manifeſt confuſion of all language and common ſenſe.

And I have been the more particular in demonſtrating by a variety of inſtances, that no book, writing, or compoſition whatever, can be underſtood by uſing words in a ſenſe contrary to their natural import, or to that which ſhall ariſe from a literal or grammatical interpretation; becauſe this ſeems to be a pretendedly ſtrong hold to which our republican and factious diſſidents in matters of religion do alway reſort in their ſlanderous ſallies, on the reaſonableneſs and efficiency of a ſubſcription.

Firſt. It is evident that the divines of the Church of England had a like reaſon for making that article the firſt, in which is amiably deſcribed the being and perfections of God, as Homer had for his uſe of his words μηνιν Αχιλλης in the firſt line of his book. For the firſt article, being deſcriptive

tive of the being and perfections of God, muſt be conſidered as a foundation upon which the other thirty-eight are raiſed as a ſuperſtructure, and taken all together they do and were intended to make one religious building or piece of religious architecture. And it is amazing that this pretender to critical divinity ſhould not have recollected that the being and perfections of God are the foundation of natural and revealed religion, and ſhould ſo indite, as if it was a diſputable point whether the ſuperſtructure ſhould be laid upon the foundation, or the foundation upon the ſuperſtructure.

Secondly. It is no leſs ſtrange, that Lucian's memory ſhould ſo totally have leaked out the firſt principles of poetical knowledge, as not to know that the author of every epic or extenſive poem makes it a point in the beginning to inform his readers of its nature and deſign, and to keep it occaſionally in view throughout the whole.

And Homer's particular reaſon for making choice of the word μηνιν muſt occur to every common reader who recollects what paſſed between Agamemnon and Achilles, in the firſt book, concerning their female captive

captive Briſeis, and how Achilles' reſentment is occaſionally continued throughout the whole poem.

Thirdly. On the word ἀειδε in this paſſage from Homer, which I have conſidered in the body of this compoſition, I ſhall make the following critical annotation:--- That the word ἀειδε muſt be taken in a much more extenſive ſenſe than the bare literal, grammatical, or dictionary conſtruction of it will directly admit of.

When Mr. Pope tranſlates the words ἀειδε θεα by heavenly Goddeſs ſing, the word ἀειδε is uſed only in its common literal ſenſe. But to ſuppoſe that Homer meant by this word to invoke his heavenly Muſe to write the poem or ſong of his Iliad, is a palpable and groſs abſurdity. The word ἀειδε therefore muſt be made to ſignify in this place a great deal more than is implied in its dictionary ſenſe, and therefore muſt be made to ſignify an addreſs to the Poet's Muſe, or Heavenly Goddeſs, for ſome inſpired or ſupernatural ſtrength of genius to ſing, or to execute his deſign in a manner acceptable both to the gods and to men. For the doctrine of divine inſpiration, with certain ſuperſtitious and enthuſiaſtic notions,

tions, have been entertained both in the gentile and chriſtian world. And thus our great Engliſh and Chriſtian Poet, Milton, abſurdly fell into the gentile practice of invoking a Muſe, as is evident from the following lines in the beginning of his Paradiſe Loſt : —

" Of Man's firſt Diſobedience, and the Fruit
" Of the forbidden Tree, whoſe mortal Taſte
" Brought Death into the World, and all our Woe,
" With loſs of Eden ; till one greater Man
" Reſtore us, and repair the bliſsful Seat,
" Sing Heavenly Muſe."

Here our chriſtian poet turns gentile, and applies for inſpiration to an Heavenly Muſe, who has no place I am ſure in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament. Dr. Newton, indeed, now Biſhop of Briſtol, who, in my opinion, is a luminary equally conſpicuous in the religious, as Sir Iſaac was in the natural world, and of which his three books on prophecy, containing the marrow of ſacred and prophane hiſtory, is a ſufficient demonſtration : Dr. Newton, indeed, I ſay, obſerves in the tenth page of his Milton's Paradiſe Loſt, that invoking the Muſe is commonly a matter of form, wherein the poet neither means,

means, nor deſires to be thought to mean any thing ſeriouſly.

But, however, our puritanic poet ſoon got rid of his gentility of invocation, addreſſing himſelf to the only true author of inſpiration in that moſt extenſive ſenſe of the word ἀοιδὴ; and thus he aſſumes the garb of a ſerious chriſtian:---

"And chiefly thou, O Spirit! that doſt prefer
"Before all Temples the upright Heart and pure,
"Inſtruct me — for thou knoweſt."

But in the following lines he comes up fully to the point of our critical annotation: For whereas Homer by his word ἀοιδὴ muſt be ſuppoſed to addreſs his Heavenly Goddeſs for ſome ſupernatural ſtrength of genius to ſing, ſo Milton humbly addreſſeth himſelf to the Holy Ghoſt for ſome divine aſſiſtance, to do juſtice to a doctrine in which the honour and glory of God were immediately concerned.

———"What in me is dark,
"Illumine; what is low, raiſe and ſupport;
"That to the height of this great Argument
"I may aſſert eternal Providence,
"And juſtify the Ways of God to Man."

CHAPTER IV.

HAVING vindicated the articles in the preceding chapter againſt an objection, that they will admit of as many different ſenſes, meanings, and interpretations, as they have readers; and that they are not intelligible in the common way of interpreting any human compoſition; I ſhall proceed in this chapter to anſwer another objection, which appears to me to be the ſame; but becauſe it is expreſſed in different terms, it is declared by the Confeſſional, and by other adverſaries of our eſtabliſhed church, to be different. And the objection is, that the church's ſenſe of the articles, and that of the articles themſelves, is different from each other; concluding this chapter with obſerving what gave riſe to this abſurd charge, when it was introduced, and in what manner it has been continued even to the preſent time.

No word or phraſe more frequently occurs in this Confeſſional, than the word church, and the church's ſenſe of the articles; nor can any one who has read him with the greateſt attention pretend to ſay in what particular ſenſe or meaning they are

are to be underſtood. The author of this book ſeems to claim a peculiar privilege to write without ideas; nor does this vague and indefinite manner of expreſſing himſelf ever fail to ſupply him with all occaſional inſtruments of falſehood and deception. I can hardly conceive that this writer can be ſo abſurd as to write of the wood, ſtones, and timber, of which a church is built, in the active voice, and to introduce theſe unintelligent materials as fixing a ſenſe upon the articles; but rather that by the church he muſt mean ſome living and intelligent perſons, who are now, and were, its proper repreſentatives in the year 1562, when theſe articles received a legiſlative ratification. And when we have clearly ſhewn who are, and have been, the proper repreſentatives of our eſtabliſhed church, there will be no difficulty in proving that this charge of the church's ſenſe of the articles being different from that of the articles themſelves is a propoſition moſt extremely abſurd, being contrary to all matter of fact and experience in every view in which it is capable of being conſidered.

To prove, therefore, who are, and have been, the proper repreſentatives of our eſtabliſhed church, and by what ſhe is re-

preſented, I ſhall make the following obſervations.

We have two words in our Engliſh tongue commonly called Church and State, which are equally expreſſive and ſignificant in two diſtinct provinces of deſign and action: For in common with other chriſtian countries we have two different conſtitutions, religious and political, being both ſettled and ratified by the ſame legiſlative authority. From hence it is evident that we have two different acts of parliament, religious and political. That every legiſlator or ſupreme magiſtrate of any kingdom, if they profeſs any religion, and they muſt be ſtrange rationals indeed not to do ſo, muſt act in the two different characters of a divine and a politician.

From whence it is evident, even in the truth of a ſelf evident propoſition, that the members of our national ſenate are the living and intelligent repreſentatives both of church and ſtate. And the true logical reaſon of it ſtands briefly thus: Every one acts in two different capacities, civil and religious; being not only members of a ſtate but members alſo of a church, or muſt not only be ſubjects of an earthly, but

but of an heavenly king and government. In things, therefore, relative to what we call civil polity, or to the preſervation of perſon and property, the legiſlative members of our national ſenate repreſent the ſtate; and in things relative to eccleſiaſtical polity, or to the public honour, ſervice, and worſhip of Almighty God, they repreſent the church; from whence we ſee, that this charge of the church's ſenſe of the articles being different from that of the articles themſelves can have no exiſtence in nature, fact, or experience: Becauſe if we conſider every legiſlator in the character of a politician, his ſenſe of an act of parliament muſt be exactly the ſame with that of the act itſelf; and if we conſider him in the different capacity of a divine, his ſenſe of a religious article muſt be the ſame with that of the article itſelf. And thus univerſally, whatever ſenſe, conception, or repreſentation of things ſhall be introduced into the mind of any particular perſon, it muſt be the ſame with what is expreſſed, delivered, and contained in any human compoſition, which is ſuppoſed to be the immediate object of his examination and inquiries, otherwiſe no book or compoſition whatſoever could be rendered intelligible. So that the articles and

prayers,

prayers, in our Common Prayer Books, may be conſidered as religious acts of a chriſtian church, with the ſame propriety as a book of Statutes are declared to be the political acts of a chriſtian ſtate. Nor can any book of religious articles and prayers, of political ſtatutes and regulations, the ill-reaſoned doctrines of a Confeſſional, or any written opinions, be rendered intelligible in any other way than in a literal conſtruction of words in which they are exhibited to our underſtanding and judgment. Nor was it ever ſuggeſted with the leaſt degree of confidence, that the legiſlators of this realm, when in ſenate aſſembled for the great end of lawgiving, ever pretended to reſerve a ſenſe to themſelves different from that of the laws, which in conſcience and judgment they thought reaſonable to enact and ratify.

Secondly. But ſince for the ſake of being fanatically employed in keeping the ſhadows of controverſy in a progreſſive ſtate, and of attempting to ſneer mankind out of the only plain and practical method of interpretation, this writer is frequently obſerving in a confuſionary kind of argumentation, that the church's ſenſe of the articles is different from that of the articles themſelves;

themſelves; if it ſhall be aſked what ſenſe the church has fixed upon them, let it be ſaid once for all, that this ſenſe of the articles muſt be repreſented by the particular doctrines which will ariſe from a literal and grammatical interpretation.

Now theſe doctrines by the repreſentatives of the church at large, and particularly by the Archbiſhops and Biſhops who are the immediate and active repreſentatives of it, have been declared agreeable both to reaſon and ſcripture, or in no caſe directly and plainly repugnant to either.

To ſuppreſs, therefore, if it was poſſible, the growth of ſchiſmatical and heretical ſectaries, which was manifeſtly occaſioned by an unjuſtifiable liberty of interpreting the articles in different and contrary ſenſes, a royal declaration was annexed to them in the reign of King James the Firſt, in which it is enjoined (for every one, whether layman or eccleſiaſtic, will be a divine to himſelf) that no eccleſiaſtical divine, in particular, ſhall put any other ſenſe on the articles, than what ſhall ariſe from a literal interpretation of words in which they are exhibited. The words of this royal declaration to this purpoſe, are theſe which follow.

That

That no one hereafter ſhall either print or preach to draw the articles aſide any way, but ſhall ſubmit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and ſhall not put his own ſenſe or comment to be the meaning of the article, but ſhall take it in the literal and grammatical ſenſe.

But, notwithſtanding, in the Confeſſ. p. 297, this confounding writer, in an inference which he draws from a diſpute between Dr. Sykes and Dr. Waterland, concludes, that the ſenſe of the articles is not fixed, that the meaning of the compilers is not known, and to keep matters under uncertainty ſeems to have been the view of the King's declaration. And in the beginning of the next page, he ſays, that the declaration ſuppoſes the articles to be drawn up in words which favour no ſide.

But why muſt it be allowed, that a King is more liable to blunder and to act wickedly by contradicting his declared intentions than the author of the Confeſſional? In another place he ſays, that the articles are dreſſed up in artificial and ſcholaſtic terms, which render the ſenſe of every propoſition in the articles extremely uncertain and

and ambiguous; but it is a peculiar prerogative claimed by this puritanic author to write without ideas, or to make uſe of words by which he has no meaning. For it may be juſtly ſaid, in a remark on theſe abſurd obſervations, that all the twenty-four letters, with a variegated arrangement of them into words, terms, phraſes, ſentences, and propoſitions, are all artificial, or the effect of art; and why muſt it be allowed, that no ſchoolmen or grammarian divines can think clearly and write intelligibly.

Many conceſſions of this nature muſt be allowed, in order to give him an opportunity of throwing the plain ſenſe of the plaineſt propoſitions in the world into a ſtate of confuſion, ridicule, and contempt. And his obſervations alſo, which I have juſt cited, are an evident proof of a ſtrong mixture of ignorance and diſhoneſty; of ignorance, in not being able to conſtrue a plain propoſition; of diſhoneſty, in repreſenting that to be uncertain which is as conſpicuous as the ſun in a ſerene ſky; and as a ſpecimen of his unintelligence and unfair dealing, let us enquire how his obſervations are applicable to the firſt propoſition of the firſt article. There is one living

and true God everlaſting, without body, parts, or paſſions, of infinite power, wiſdom, and goodneſs, the maker and preſerver of all things, both viſible and inviſible.

If theſe words in the opinion of this unilluminated genius may be taken in a ſenſe contrary to the natural import of the words, then the ſame propoſition which was intended to be, and in reality is expreſſive of the ſettled faith of pious theiſm, may repreſent alſo the ſceptiſm and infidelity of an atheiſt; for which unexpected and uſeful diſcovery, no doubt but in the opinion of every ſound logician he will deſerve the character of a moſt excellent interpreter of articles, and be juſtly eſteemed a flower of divines.

A clear propoſition, perhaps, of this nature in the hands of a Grecian Gorgias, who, as Tully has related in his book of oratory, pretended to diſpute, extempore, upon any given point, with equal juſtneſs and propriety, as other philoſophers, under the common advantage of a previous conſideration; and who, during his reſidence at Athens, had made the coat upon his back, the ſhoes upon his feet, and the ring upon his finger; a clear propoſition, I ſay,

of

of this nature, might be repreſented by a Greek Gorgias as ſtoical, epicurenean, or pyrrenian, though it is evidently ſocratical, and platonic, and in the hands of an Engliſh literary militant it is pronounced to be calviniſtical, arminian, or ante-calviniſtical and ante-arminian; or it is declared to be any thing but what in reality it is in the judgment and determination of common ſenſe. Let us try again, out of curioſity, what confuſionary work he will make with the two following propoſitions of the 37th Article: The Queen's Majeſty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all eſtates of this realm, whether they be eccleſiaſtical or civil, in all cauſes doth appertain, and is not, and ought not, to be ſubject to any foreign juriſdiction; and that the Biſhop of Rome hath no juriſdiction in this realm of England.

The Confeſſional ſays, that to keep matters under uncertainty ſeems to have been the view of the King's declaration, and that the declaration ſuppoſes the articles, without exception, to be drawn up in terms which favour no ſide. But is it any way probable, that King James the Firſt, who was ex-

tremely tenacious of power, and who had written an argumentative and ſenſible treatiſe againſt the Pope's infallibility and eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction in this realm, could be ſuppoſed to annex a declaration to the articles, with a deſign to ſignify to his ſubjects, that whether the Pope had any lawful juriſdiction in this realm, was a point extremely dubious and controverſial? From obſervations of this ſort, I am tempted to obſerve upon the occaſion, that this writer has exceeded any Grecian ſophiſt in a ſubtlety to introduce a confuſion of ſight in the noontide of viſion, and to vindicate the expediency of the Italian uſe of ſpectacles even in the full-eyed vigour of juvenility.

Thirdly, Having thus clearly illuſtrated, that the church's ſenſe of the articles, if the church ſhall be repreſented by any intelligent perſon, muſt be the ſame with that of the articles themſelves, in anſwer to a contrary doctrine, which has been artfully branched out and copiouſly enlarged upon, with a deſign, and indeed in one view it has its deſired effect, to introduce a party oppoſition, but unexpectedly it proved a very inefficient one; and having expoſed alſo a prodigious want of honeſty and

and judgment, properly to diſtinguiſh between objects of ambiguity and diſpute, from thoſe of acknowledged truth and univerſal content; for every branch of religious and natural philoſophy have their certain and uncertain, their fixed and dubitable points; nor have the ſhadows of the latter, amongſt the judicious and diſcerning part of mankind, been ever ſuffered to eclipſe the brightneſs and ſunſhine of the other. But this puritan, with other preſbytery and republican adverſaries of our eſtabliſhed church, has thrown the doctrine of the Being and Perfections of God, which are moſt admirably and beautifully deſcribed in the firſt article, the doctrines alſo of our Saviour's divinity, his incarnation, crucifixion, reſurrection, and aſcenſion, being doctrines and matters of fact clearly ſet forth in the articles, and which have been univerſally received by the members of every popiſh and proteſtant church in Europe; theſe indiſputable doctrines and matters of fact, I ſay, have been thrown into one common undiſtinguiſhing and promiſcuous budget of ſceptical ambiguity. From whence theſe genius's have artfully attempted to prove, that the author's ſenſe of his book, and that of the book itſelf, may not only be different from, but contrary

trary to, each other; and that this is really the caſe with the church and her articles. Surely this muſt be received as excellent logic and ſound divinity. But not to dwell any longer upon a confutation of ſuch abſurdities, for a concluſion of this chapter, I ſhall proceed to obſerve what gave riſe to this abſurd charge when it was introduced, and in what manner it has been coutinued to the preſent time.

Firſt, This notion of a double ſenſe, meaning, or interpretation of the articles, had a faint exiſtence in the unprofitably diſputatious reign of King James the Firſt, when divines in general, in compliance with the controverſial humour of royal divinity, began to diſtinguiſh the articles with the abſurd appellations of arminian, calviniſtical, and eraſtian; ſo that they fell into a way of not duly attending to the deſign of compiling the articles to the nature of them, as agreeable to reaſon and ſcripture, nor to the expediency of a ſubſcription, chiefly turning their religious enquiries on the five points of Scotch divinity, commonly called grace, election, predeſtination, juſtification, and ſanctification; nor in their religious animadverſions on theſe points did they turn out any thing much inſtructive

inſtructive to themſelves, or of edification to their reſpective audiences.

Secondly, To aſſert that theſe doctrines are not delivered by St. Paul in his epiſtolary writings, in a manner conſiſtent with the moral attributes or perfections of God, would be a ſtrange aſſertion indeed, and in this manner they may be, and always have been, explained by ſenſible and judicious divines; but though theſe five doctrinal points of divinity, and ſome of the articles, have been differently conceived and repreſented, yet the one, as enforced by St. Paul, conſiſtent with the moral attributes or perfections of God, and the other, as declared to be conſonant to reaſon and ſcripture, can poſſibly admit but of one ſenſe, meaning, or interpretation. And it here deſerves our particular notice, that in this ſophiſtically diſputatious age, in matters of divinity, the doctrine of the trinity was uniformly believed and maintained by divines of every denomination, both in their writings and in the pulpit.

Thirdly, But in the reign of Queen Anne in the famous arian controverſy, which was begun by Mr. Whiſton, and continued by a few of his arian friends and

and adherents, this double ſenſe of the articles was plainly and directly aſſerted, though it was principally confined to the ſecond and fifth articles, in which the divinity of Chriſt and of the Holy Ghoſt is particularly exhibited; but the Confeſſional has declared, that all the articles, and conſequently that every propoſition contained in them, will admit of a double ſenſe, and may be taken in that which is contrary to the natural import of the words in which they are expreſſed: But this is a rank falſehood, beyond any thing which is abſurd and ridiculous [is a moſt flagitious and execrable ſlander], being a contradiction to truth beyond any parallel. For when it is declared in the articles, there is one living and true God, everlaſting, without body, parts, or paſſions, of infinite power, wiſdom, and goodneſs, the maker and preſerver of all things, both viſible and inviſible; that Chriſt was born of the Virgin Mary in his incarnate ſtate, his crucifixion, reſurrection, and aſcenſion, a future ſtate of reward and puniſhment, are doctrines and matters of fact in the articles which have been univerſally believed, in a literal interpretation of words, by the members of every roman and proteſtant church.

And

And we may alſo aſſert, that tranſubſtantiation, works of ſupererogation, ſeven ſacraments, the invocation of ſaints, the worſhip of images, the Pope's infallibility and univerſal ſupremacy in the chriſtian world, are declared in the articles, and by every individual member of a proteſtant church, repugnant to reaſon and to the Holy Scriptures.

To affirm, therefore, that every article will admit of a double ſenſe and contrary meaning, is ſomething which may be pronounced not only an abomination againſt Man, but againſt the Lord.

Fourthly, In this Whiſtonian controverſy, the Diſputants' terms of calviniſtical, arminian, and eraſtian, which were uſed in the religious diſputes of the reign of King James the Firſt, were now revived in this of Queen Anne; and never failed to ſupply the church-militants with all neceſſary and occaſional weapons of attack & retaliation.

In the truth of this animadverſion we find Honeſt William Whiſton, as he was commonly called both by his friends and enemies, declaring in the following words, that he, and others of his euſebian opinion,

might as innocently ſubſcribe athanaſian articles without being athanaſians, as Dr. Waterland and the Church without being calviniſts do ſign calviniſt articles†. From hence the nature and abſurd charge of a double ſenſe may be thus briefly accounted for and explained.

It was declared by the divines of our conſtitutional and religious convocation, and by all the divines of our legiſlative authority, that the articles are agreeable to Holy Scripture. From hence the arians claimed a liberty of ſubſcribing to an article in any ſenſe which they ſhould think agreeable to Holy Scripture, even though their ſenſe of it ſhould be directly contrary to that which ariſeth from a literal interpretation of the article; ſo that the arians have pronounced themſelves at liberty to ſubſcribe thoſe articles, which imply an equality of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt, with the Father, in a ſenſe which implieth an inequality; which is nothing better than if a perſon ſhould claim the innocent liberty of affirming, that two parallel lines, if produced, will meet in a given point, when he knows that if two parallel lines ſhould be produced *ad infinitum*, they can never meet in any given point; or, in common

† Whiſton's Hiſtorical Life, and Memoirs of Dr. Clarke.

mon life, if I believe that a man was at York on the 6th of February, I am at liberty to ſwear, in a matter of giving evidence in a common court of judicature, that he was at London. Nor ſhall I make any more obſervations on this abſurd opinion and execrable practice of arianiſm, which [in a ſophiſtical and greek Polus's method of arguing] has a natural tendency to mock God, impoſe upon conſcience, and deceive the Devil. But not to omit any conſideration which might poſſibly give birth to this double and contrary ſenſe of the articles, of which ſuch an abominable uſe has been made by the Confeſſional and by other arian confederates, and ſince it might poſſibly receive ſome countenance from the double doctrine of ſome of the prophetical parts of the Old Teſtament, I ſhall conclude this Chapter with the following explication of this double doctrine of ſome of the prophetical parts of the Old Teſtament, in which, perhaps, the reader will find ſome entertainment and inſtruction.

In the 10th verſe of the 16th Pſalm, it is ſaid, "*Thou wilt not leave my ſoul in hell, neither wilt thou ſuffer thine holy one to ſee corruption.*" It is neceſſary to ob-

ſerve here, that the hebrew word שאול anſwering to the word hell in our Engliſh tranſlation, is rendered by the learned Buxtorf, *ſepulchrum, aut infimus locus*, which I call a cave, an hollow place or dungeon, made in the earth by nature or deſign. In ſuch places David had been obliged to conceal himſelf from the hunting and perſecuting ſpies of Saul. And the hebrew word שחת, which anſwers to the Engliſh word corruption, is rendered by the latin word *foſſa*, which I call a ditch or a pit; and then the hebrew verſe, in the application of it to David, may be thus paraphraſtically and juſtly explained: Thou wilt not ſuffer me to be cut off in a cave, in which I am concealing myſelf from the ſpies of Saul, and afterwards ſuffer my body to be thrown into a common ditch or pit, and there to undergo a ſtate of putrefaction and corruption, not being buried after the manner and cuſtom of my fathers. From ſuch undeſirable and melancholy events David humbly prayed to his God that he might be delivered. And, in all probability, ſuch undeſirable and melancholy events had happened, unleſs the malicious and perſecuting deſigns of Saul had been providentially prevented.

From

From ſuch calamities David prayed to be delivered, and that his prayers ſhould be accepted, no doubt but he had the moſt comfortable aſſurances from the holy ſpirit of God; and, therefore, the hebrew verſe is thus pertinently and conciſely tranſlated: Thou wilt not, or haſt not, left my ſoul in hell, neither wilt, or haſt, thou ſuffered thine holy one to ſee corruption; *i. e.* to ſee corruption in a common ditch or pit, but to be buried after the manner and cuſtom of my fathers.

Now in the 2d and 13th chapters of the Acts of the Apoſtles, in their application of it to our Bleſſed Saviour, the hebrew word, which ſignifieth one of David's hiding places from the ſpies of Saul, muſt be interpreted a ſepulchre or a grave, and then the prophetical application of it to Chriſt, is thus naturally explained: Thou wilt not leave my ſoul, or me, in the grave, neither wilt thou ſuffer thine holy one to ſee corruption. The word corruption being ſubſtituted for the conſequential effect of a dead body's lying in a ditch or in a grave.

Secondly, Let us take another ſample of this double doctrine and different ſenſe, in which

which the Confeſſional every where inſiſts that the articles may be underſtood; and this will occur in the firſt verſe of the 110th Pſalm,--- "*The Lord ſaid unto my lord, ſit thou on my right-hand, until I make thine enemies thy footſtool.*" Every divine muſt be ſuppoſed to know, that the Lord is of the ſame import, in the writings of the Old Teſtament, with the God of Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob. Now the words, my lord, are a term of appellation, in which David was addreſſed by his ſubjects in the character of a King; and then the verſe before us may be thus naturally rendered: The Lord ſaid unto me, who am called my lord, ſit thou on my right-hand, till I make thine enemies thy footſtool; *i. e.* thou ſhalt be ſupported by the ſtrength of my right-hand, or of my Almighty power, in the overthrow or deſtruction of thine enemies. Now in the 12th chapter of St. Mark, in which an application is made of this verſe by Chriſt himſelf to himſelf, it is thus eaſily explained.

The Lord, by a miraculous interpoſition of divine power in his incarnate ſtate, was to be born of the Virgin Mary, in a deſcending line of genealogy from David, and, therefore,

therefore, is properly called the Son of David: And accordingly in his triumphant entrance into Jeruſalem, a vociferating multitude of the Jews, in acclamations of divine honour, proclaim, Hoſanna to the Son of David, Hoſanna in the Higheſt.

In the 12th chapter of St. Mark, Chriſt addreſſing himſelf to the Jews at large propoundeth the following queſtion: "*How ſay the ſcribes that Chriſt is the ſon of David, for David himſelf ſaith, by the Holy Ghoſt, the Lord ſaid unto my lord, ſit thou on my right-hand until I make thine enemies thy footſtool: David, therefore, himſelf calleth him Lord, how is he then his ſon?* However difficult this queſtion might appear to a great part of his jewiſh audience, yet to every chriſtian who acknowledgeth our Lord's incarnation, it is eaſy and natural. And ſince Chriſt himſelf has declared, beyond all controverſy, that the ſon of David was the very Lord by whom David was comfortably aſſured that he ſhould be providentially aſſiſted in the overthrow of his enemies; what more direct proof can any Lindſeyan or Jebbite require of our Saviour's divinity. Theſe two remarkable and prophetical paſſages in the Pſalms are, I think, a ſufficient demonſtration of the double

double doctrine and different ſenſe in which they were explained by Chriſt and his inſpired Apoſtles. But no ſuch double doctrine or different ſenſe can be aſcribed to any human compoſition of which the articles are one, becauſe they are not prophetically applicable to any other thing or perſons than to ſuch as they ſingly and immediately relate. So that we may univerſally aſſert, that the articles, and every uninſpired book, muſt be underſtood in a literal and grammatical ſenſe; or, as Dr. Nicholls obſerves, in ſuch a ſenſe as the words, in which any propoſition is delivered, will fairly admit of; but not in a ſenſe, as the Confeſſional has falſely and ſlanderouſly reported of Dr. Bennett, which is contrary to the natural import of the words in which it is expreſſed.

From hence, alſo, I conceive it has been clearly proved, that to attribute different qualities and different methods of interpretation to the book of articles, than do belong to every different ſpecies of modern and ancient compoſition, is utterly unjuſtifiable: Though the Confeſſional, to whom have been ſeemingly committed the oracles of modern and calviniſtical diſſention, confidently affirms, that the church's ſenſe of the articles (a phraſe full of myſtery both

to

to himſelf and to his readers) is not eaſily to be found, even though a perſon ſhall look for it with the utmoſt diligence and ſagacity. And if there was any truth in the charge, it would be an inſuperable objection againſt the reaſonableneſs of a ſubſcription; becauſe no one can ſubſcribe to the truth of a propoſition in the book of articles, or in any other book, which the mind does not perceive; for a diſcovery of truth muſt always precede an acknowledgment of it. And I am not at all ſurprized, that the Confeſſional and all other opponents of an euſebian caſt ſhould declare, that the ſenſe of the articles is ambiguouſly myſterious, ſince they were perverſely reſolved not to look for it in a literal and grammatical conſtruction of words, which by a royal declaration they are directed to do, and in which, according to a common method of interpreting both living and dead languages, it may be ſaid to have a ſunſhine perſpicuity. Nor can I help obſerving once for all upon this head, that whoever is not able to read and interpret an article in its literal and grammatical ſenſe, is unqualified to teach grammar in any of our public ſchools, and to be initiated into the academical miniſtry of the eſtabliſhed Church of England.

CHAPTER V.

IT will be the buſineſs of this Chapter to anſwer an objection againſt the neceſſity and reaſonableneſs of a ſubſcription, which is drawn from the deſign of compiling the articles, as it is expreſſed in the title annexed to them. And ſince the adverſaries of our eſtabliſhed church have declared alſo, that the compiler, and the deſign of compiling the articles, are things not well known, or at leaſt are very ambiguous, I will undertake, on theſe heads, to give them the moſt plain and ſatisfactory information.

Firſt. The title annexed to the articles runs in the following words.

Articles agreed upon by the Archbiſhops and Biſhops of both provinces, and the whole Clergy, in the convocation holden at London, in the year 1562, for the avoiding of diverſities of opinions, and for the eſtabliſhing of conſent, touching true religion.

Now, becauſe it is ſaid that the articles were intended for avoiding diverſities of opinions, the adverſaries of our religious eſtabliſhment have unfairly and unjuſtly declared,

declared, that, from the time of compiling and publiſhing the articles, no individual perſon in the age of maturity and in the whole kingdom, could exiſt in the character of an atheiſt, deiſt, jew, or papiſt.

And from hence our acute enemies have, from falſe premiſes, drawn this juſt and logical concluſion, that the deſign of compiling the articles implieth ſomething impoſſible, and therefore impracticable. But to prevent a diverſity of opinion in ſuch an univerſal or unlimited ſenſe, however deſirable it might be in itſelf, was never intended; and, indeed, the compilers of the articles were too well acquainted with human nature to expect it. Though, in a partial and limited ſenſe, a prevention of different and contrary opinions in religion was really intended, and it proved ſo far ſucceſsful as to be the means of eſtabliſhing a chriſtian proteſtant church, and of conſcientiouſly obliging the inhabitants of this realm to live in a ſtate of ſocial peace, and of civil communion with each other.

Secondly. The Author of the Confeſſional * peremptorily inſiſts upon it, and is angry

* Confeſſional, page 232.

angry with every one who ſhall not be diſpoſed to give him credit for the truth of this aſſertion, that, upon a publication of the articles, in the expectation of thoſe who gave them a legiſlative ſanction, atheiſm, deiſm, judaiſm, and popery, would be immediately and totally eradicated; and therefore ſays it was the attempt of the firſt Reformers, and is ſtill the ſcheme of the Churches of England and Ireland.

The famous Dr. Clayton, and pretendedly infallible arian, ſays, that any attempt towards avoiding a diverſity of opinion, is not only an uſeleſs, but an impracticable ſcheme; and adds further, that he did not only doubt whether the compilers of the articles, but even whether any two thinking men, ever agreed exactly in their opinion, not only with regard to all the articles, but even with regard to any one of them. Upon this occaſion I cannot help aſking, If the Doctor, when he reſolved to communicate his opinion to the public, was in a ſtate of torpitude or activity, in a diſpoſition to propagate truth or falſehood? And, indeed, the nature of his aſſertion ſufficiently juſtifies my aſking the queſtion, however hard it may bear upon his moral character.

For

For is it reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that no two perſons did exactly agree, that there is one living and true God, everlaſting; without body, parts, and paſſions; of infinite power, wiſdom, and goodneſs; the maker and preſerver of all things, both viſible and inviſible: That no two perſons ever aſſented to the equality of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt with the Father, to the doctrine of a future ſtate, to the Pope's having no right to exerciſe any eccleſiaſtical authority and juriſdiction in this realm, and to tranſubſtantiation's being repugnant to reaſon and ſcripture? And could the Doctor be conceived ſo ignorant as not to know that theſe doctrines are clearly and particularly expreſſed in the articles? I readily allow that Dr. Clayton was a man of genius and ability, having more merit in the literary world than is to be aſcribed to the generality of his order; but a few great genius's, when they have fallen in the way of pride and ambition, to oppoſe an eſtabliſhment, and to exalt themſelves to the dignity of ſomething more than human, or to that of an angelic reformiſt, have been diſpoſed to pay too great a compliment to their underſtanding, and to expect credit from the world to opinions, the moſt ridiculous and abſurd. Let us, therefore, on this point,

point, with particular attention, enquire in what ſenſe the firſt preachers of the Goſpel intended to prevent a diverſity of opinion, and then make an application of it to thoſe who were originally concerned in a compiling and publication of the articles.

When our Bleſſed Saviour, by ſome irreſiſtible kind of grace, was pleaſed to call into his immediate ſervice twelve Jews, who are called Apoſtles; and who, with all readineſs and humbleneſs of mind, did agree to place themſelves at all times, and in all circumſtances, under his inſtructions and abſolute authority; by animadverting, as infinite wiſdom did ſuggeſt, on the predictions of the prophets concerning their expected Meſſiah, and on the nature of the miracles which he was to perform as evidences of his divinity, and of his divine miſſion; by animadverting alſo in ſuch ſufficiency of evidence and conviction, as no mortal can be a competent judge, on the ſacrificial parts of the law, being types, ſymbols, and repreſentations of Chriſt; and that upon his coming into the world, a continuance of theſe ſacrificial parts of the law could be no longer neceſſary; and that when the ſubſtance ſhould be removed by his aſcenſion

ſion into heaven, its ſhadow muſt of conſequence vaniſh: And if to ſuch animadverſions, attended with an irreſiſtible † kind of grace, we add the Apoſtle's own experience of the miracles which he daily performed

† There are two kinds of grace, which I call reſiſtible and irreſiſtible: The reſiſtible ariſeth from the various misfortunes, from the daily mortality and death of human nature, and from a regular adminiſtration of God's holy words and Sacraments; being means of grace intended for the reformation of great ſinners, and for making good men better; theſe being means of grace which I call reſiſtible, becauſe they are not always ſufficient, or effectual, for a purpoſe ſo important and deſirable. But the irreſiſtible kind of grace proceeds from ſome immediate interpoſition and operation of Providence, in appointing ſome particular perſons to be inſtruments of anſwering a particular end, which Providence herſelf has undertaken to accompliſh. There being the higheſt abſurdity in ſuppoſing, that Providence ſhould ever make uſe of any means of grace for obtaining an end which ſhould prove ineffectual or inſufficient; and, therefore, with great propriety, I call ſuch means of grace irreſiſtible. For inſtance, in the three following caſes: —

Firſt. When it pleaſed God, or Chriſt, to call a certain number of Jews into his immediate ſervice, with a deſign to employ them in the character of Chriſtian Apoſtles, for a gradual reformation of mankind from judaiſm and idolatry, there was ſomething in giving ſuch evidence and conviction, as was neceſſary to prove the divinity of it, which was irreſiſtible: And, therefore, with the greateſt poſſible readineſs and humility of mind they obeyed; and, with an unparalleled conſtancy, adhered to the call, in defiance of the moſt ignominious, cruel, and painful ſufferings.

Secondly. When it pleaſed Almighty God to call Moſes into his immediate ſervice, for undertaking a deliverance of his Iſraelitiſh brethren from a ſtate of Egyptian bondage, his applying to the king of the country for a perſonal conference concerning it, Pharaoh's eaſy inclination

performed in proof of his being the real Chriſt, or the true Meſſiah, a diverſity of opinion, as it is expreſſed in the title to the articles, was avoided, or certain religious doctrines which exiſted in the mind of Chriſt, were introduced into that of the Apoſtles, and had a firm exiſtence there, as an invariable rule of faith. And when our Bleſſed Saviour was pleaſed to quit the preſent ſtage of action, the Apoſtles, by the natural influence of miracles, and by preaching againſt the corruptions of judaiſm, and againſt the ignorances and ſuperſtitions of idolatry, were continually diminiſhing a diverſity of opinion, by cauſing multitudes, both of jews and heathens, to profeſs and publickly to acknowledge the chriſtian faith.

Thirdly,

to admit of ſuch a conference, and the diſpoſition of every individual Iſraelite to accept of ſuch a deliverance as was afterwards effected, are circumſtances which muſt be imputed to certain impreſſions, made on the hearts of men by ſome irreſiſtible means of grace.

Thirdly. When St. Paul was divinely exhorted to renounce judaiſm and to plead the cauſe of chriſtianity, it is evident, that the ordinary means of grace were not ſufficient for his converſion: And he frequently mentions his want of due attention to, and a right conſideration of, the miracles which had been wrought by the other Apoſtles to prove the divinity of their religion, as a matter of great uneaſineſs and diſquietude of mind; expreſſing at the ſame time his unworthineſs of that irreſiſtible kind of grace, by which the eyes of his underſtan ling and judgment had been opened, to diſcern and acknowledge the truth in Jeſus.

Thirdly. And now let us make an application of thus removing a diverſity of opinion, by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, to thoſe who were originally concerned in a compiling and publication of the articles.

Firſt. In the reign of Queen Mary, when chriſtianity was taught and practiſed under a diſpenſation moſt cruel and bloody; or when the faith of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, was to be tried and purified by fire, though I am ſure it was a fire very different from that purifying one of faith, which is mentioned by the original preachers of univerſal righteouſneſs and charity, it is well known that popery was the eſtabliſhed religion of this country: But, upon a proteſtant princeſs immediately ſucceeding to the throne, ſhe wiſely thought that it muſt be of great temporal benefit and advantage to her ſubjects, to eradicate the Pope's ſupremacy and juriſdiction from her dominions; and being convinced, likewiſe, of its being her duty to have the chriſtian religion preached and propagated in its genuine purity, as diſengaged from the erroneous doctrines and ſuperſtitions of popery, ſhe called a parliament of lay, and a clerical convocation of proteſtant divines (for every rational, in a civilized nation,

muſt act in the two different, though not oppoſite characters, of a divine and a politician). In the convocation the thirty-nine articles were agreed to, and declared directly conſonant both to reaſon and ſcripture; they were recommended to the parliament for a legiſlative ſanction, and they appeared ſo unobjectionable, that ſuch a legiſlative ſanction they eaſily and readily obtained. And thus it came to paſs, that in the common courſe of things, under the direction of a particular providence, by arguments made uſe of in private converſation, and from the pulpit, in defence of the articles, in which the groſs errors and ſuperſtitions of the Romiſh Church are particularly ſpecified, and muſt be admitted as reaſons why the Church of England proteſted againſt and ſeparated from her communion, that the number of papiſts were gradually leſſened, and that of proteſtants continually encreaſed, till a majority of the inhabitants of this realm became members of a proteſtant church, which has been eſtabliſhed, in oppoſition to popery, to the ſcholars of Luther, and to the diſciples of Calvin.

In this view of things we ſee, that the Meſſiah's intention to convert both jews and

and heathens to a ſincere belief and profeſſion of his goſpel, and the deſign of a proteſtant Princeſs, to eſtabliſh proteſtantiſm in oppoſition to popery, was ſimilar, and both proved ſucceſsful for avoiding of diverſities of opinion, and for the eſtabliſhing of conſent, touching that true religion, of which Chriſt, in the plenitude of divine power, conſtituted himſelf the firſt preacher, and has a providential ſettlement in this kingdom refined from the corruptions and impurities of popery.

Secondly. Another objection againſt the reaſonableneſs of ſubſcribing to the thirty-nine articles, is founded by the adverſaries of our eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, on its not being clearly known who was principally concerned in their compilation, and on the unapparent deſign of doing ſo. The author of the Confeſſional, I think, is the only ſenſible man who ever propoſed to meaſure the excellencies and perfections of a compoſition by the name of its compoſer, and by that of ſome particular place in which he was ſuppoſed to reſide. He hints, indeed, that Cranmer, for he cannot write reſpectfully of any dignified man in the Church of England, was concerned in a compilation of religious articles, in the

reign of King Edward the Sixth; but whether the articles were drawn up in the year 1562, by the ghoſt of a dead man, or by the mind of a living one, is a point which he thinks, in a fit of erroneous conjecture, cannot be determined with any the leaſt degree of accuracy or preciſion; and ſince, I believe, he was equally ignorant, as he did profeſs to be; on this point, therefore, I ſhall proceed to give the adverſaries of our eſtabliſhed church the moſt ſatisfactory intelligence.

Thirdly. From the truth of hiſtory, and from the facts of experience, founded on an unavoidable and providential difference of human underſtandings and judgment, it is well known, that in all large convocations of men, one or two perſons, in popular eſteem for great abilities, do begin and execute the buſineſs of their intended convention. Now, in the year 1562, the great Jewel was a member of the convocation, Biſhop of Saliſbury, and had written a little but moſt excellent treatiſe, called, An Apology for the Church of England; and in my opinion, for the following reaſons, was principally concerned in a compilation of the articles: This Biſhop Jewel was no leſs eminently wiſe, learned, and judicious, than

than pious, good, and charitable. In the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, through the miſchievous effects of Romiſh policy and intrigue, he, as an honeſt and able proſtant, was expelled Corpus Chriſti College, in Oxford.

To avoid the impending tempeſts of popiſh perſecution he prudentially reſolved to travel, till a favourable opportunity ſhould be offered of returning into his own country, in that ſtate of protection, for perſon and property, which is one of the great and deſirable ends of civil government: And, indeed, ſuch a favourable opportunity, attended with circumſtances beyond expectation, was given him upon the ſhort-lived reign of the bigotted and deluded Mary.* His having travelled through popiſh

* Dr. Edwyn Sandys, who, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, was made Biſhop of London, and afterwards Archbiſhop of York, was obliged alſo to ſeek for refuge in other countries. In his travels he met, and frequently removed from place to place with Mr. Jewel; and they enjoyed the higheſt mutual conſolation under the great difficulties in which, through the unjuſt and oppreſſive violences of perſecution, they were involved. So that from the intimacy which ſubſiſted between them, a compilation of the articles, in all probability, was the joint labour of theſe two great geniuſſes. Nor is it likely that proteſtantiſm could have made ſuch rapid progreſs towards a ſecure eſtabliſhment, unleſs that Providence had directed the

popiſh countries, enabled him to be thoroughly acquainted with all the gainful inventions and impoſitions of popery, and beſt qualified him to draw thoſe boundaries between proteſtantiſm and popery, which in the articles are particularly ſpecified. And when I ſhall conſider, as I propoſe to do in the next chapter, how the conſonancy of the articles to Holy Scripture, and to the practice of the pureſt ages of chriſtianity, is undertaken to be proved and ſupported in his apology, that he was principally concerned in compiling them, is a circumſtance which will be excluded from any degree of doubtfulneſs or ambiguity

Fourthly.

the Queen to have made choice of a Whitgift to govern the church, and a Cecil to direct the helm of ſtate. For whereas the one was ſagacious, vigilant, and active, the other had no leſs circumſpection to diſcern, and fortitude to counteract and defeat, the factious machinations of puritans and papiſts. It is allowed by the Confeſſional, in page 249, and it is confirmed by hiſtorical memoirs, annexed to the great Hooker's eccleſiaſtical polity, that the puritans were equal enemies to the Queen's perſon and government, as the papiſts. And, indeed, theſe pretendedly pure and righteous geniuſſes, even to a degree of ſupererogation, with the whole gentry of nonconformiſts, were hypocritically joined and encouraged by the Earl of Leiceſter; but, by the providentially favoured vigilance of the two able governors of church and ſtate, their ſecret intrigues and public oppoſitions proved very inefficient to a revolution.

Fourthly. The deſign of compiling the articles is declared by the adverſaries of our eſtabliſhed church to be unevident or uncertain; yet the reaſonableneſs and neceſſity of it, if we conſider by what reaſons and motives the generality of mankind are influenced, is equally conſpicuous as the ſun in a ſerene ſky.

Now the deſign of compiling the articles had theſe two points evidently in view: To exclude all arians and papiſts from the miniſtry, and to ſettle the boundaries between proteſtantiſm and popery; or to ſpecify the particular erroneous and unſcriptural doctrines, for which we proteſt againſt, and ſeparate ourſelves from, a communion with the Chriſtian Church of Rome.

It is artfully inſinuated by our enemies at large, and by the Confeſſional in particular, that honeſty and ability are the only requiſite qualifications for an admiſſion into the miniſtry of a chriſtian church; but I hope that the following animadverſions will clearly and fully evince the abſurdity of ſuch an aſſertion.

Firſt. By much the greateſt part of the members

members of the Church of England, for I will not undertake to anſwer for every individual, are not aſhamed to declare to all the world, that they are members not only of a chriſtian, but of a trinitarian and proteſtant church; and in conſequence of it they would induſtriouſly exclude all arians and papiſts from the miniſtry, however honeſt and conſcientious they ſhall be, and however high any one ſhall be diſpoſed to rate their abilities.

So that by a ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles, not only arians and papiſts, but even atheiſts and deiſts are conſequentially rejected; becauſe a ſubſcription is required to articles, which no honeſt and conſcientious men of theſe four different denominations can be ſuppoſed to ſubſcribe: But becauſe atheiſts and deiſts may be conſidered as irregular and monſtrous productions, which bear a ſmall or no proportion to thoſe which are homogeneous and uniform, their excluſion from the miniſtry had nothing, perhaps, in the deſign of compiling the articles, directly and immediately intentional.

Secondly. In oppoſition to what has been artfully inſinuated by our adverſaries, and by

by the Confeſſional in particular, that honeſt or conſcientious men, with proper degrees of ability, are qualified for the ſacred miniſtry of our eſtabliſhed church, it may juſtly be ſaid that men only of this character can be excluded from any ſociety; becauſe, for inſtance, an unprincipled or thoroughly hypocritical Mohammedan, for the ſake of great emoluments, will ſubſcribe to the divinity of Chriſt; and a Chriſtian of the ſame unhappy turn, for a ſimilar reaſon, may readily aſſent to the divine miſſion of Mohammed; but no honeſt or conſcientious man can reſolve to do ſo without the utmoſt abhorrence, nor without kindling and ſupporting in his mind, an internal and perpetual hell.

Thirdly. The means neceſſary for the attainment of any particular end, in all caſes and circumſtances whatſoever, are evident diſcoveries of each other. Since, therefore, by a required ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles, no honeſt or conſcientious arian or papiſt can apply for an initiation into the miniſtry of our eſtabliſhed church, the means made uſe of for the excluſion of men of ſuch religious tenets, evidently demonſtrate the end propoſed by a compilation of the articles. In direct

contradiction to what has been confidently and maliciouſly aſſerted, that the deſign of compiling the articles is a point myſteriouſly ambiguous, and to juſtify both the reaſonableneſs and neceſſity of a ſubſcription, let us appeal to the opinions and practice of civil government, in all the different States of Europe. Could the King of France, conſidered at the head of a trinitarian and roman-catholic church, without incurring the imputation of ideotiſm or inſanity, reſolve to prefer arians and proteſtants to the dignity of cardinals and prelates? And, without acting equally abſurd, could the ſame perſon at the head of a monarchial ſtate, fill the prime offices, of every civil department, with rigid Prieſtly republicans, or with enthuſiaſtical and Pricean democratics?--- Let us alſo put the queſtion more directly and pertinently to ourſelves, Could the King of England, at the head of a trinitarian and proteſtant church, without the higheſt indiſcretion, give the dignity and influence of a biſhop to an arian and a papiſt; or, without manifeſt hazard of ſelf-deſtruction, reſolve to place the treaſury, his fleets, and armies, under the directions of republicans, papiſts, and jacobites? And ſimilar obſervations may be applied to the practice of all the other different States of Europe.

Jeſus

Jeſus Chriſt, indeed, has evidently declared, that no jew, idolater, heathen, or infidel, if ſincere in their religious opinions, ought to be impriſoned and executed, nor to have the leaſt injury offered to perſon and property, by calling down fire from heaven to conſume them; but he has confirmed the unreaſonableneſs of admitting men of ſuch an unhappy caſt, whilſt unconverted, as miniſters, and to the miniſtry of a chriſtian church. Nature, intereſt, and every rule of good polity, call upon every chriſtian king, in advice with the moſt judicious and eminent divines, to eſtabliſh certain articles of faith, neceſſary to the ſalvation of every chriſtian ſoul, and to aſcertain doctrinal points of behaviour, duty, and obedience; and whilſt the Being and ſuperintending Providence of God ſhall be univerſally believed and acknowledged, a confirmation of all promiſes and engagements, which fall within the bounds of fidelity and allegiance, will be required upon oath; and this demand of chriſtian governors may be ſaid not only in the ambiguouſneſs of probability, but in the certainty of truth, to be ſanctioned by divine authority.

Fourthly. There is equal abſurdity in

pretending to govern the chriſtian viſible church, without written articles of faith and rules of miniſterial duty, as in pretending to govern a chriſtian viſible ſtate, without public and written laws, ſpecifying particular acts of diſobedience and rebellion. For ſince all government is expreſſive of a power in ſuperiors to cenſure and puniſh inferiors for certain offences or tranſgreſſions which they ſhall commit, without ſome public and written rules of duty and obedience, no puniſhment in any caſe could be legally inflicted: With equal propriety it may be ſaid, that Chriſt is at the head of a chriſtian ſtate, as of a chriſtian church; and whereas the former ought to be governed by the laws of chriſtian morality, ſo ought the latter, in the internal parts of it, to be directed by certain articles of a chriſtian faith, and in the externals of it by ſuch canons and ordinances of public ſervice and worſhip, as chriſtian governors ſhall inſtitute and ordain. This doctrine is evidently implied in the ſecond collect, appointed to be read in our communion ſervice, in the following words: "*Almighty and everlaſting God, we are taught by thy holy word that the hearts of kings are in thy rule and governance, and that thou doſt diſpoſe and turn them*

them as it ſeemeth beſt to thy godly wiſdom;" from whence I conclude, that the minds of the ſame governors of a chriſtian ſtate and church may, in both caſes, be directed by the divine ſpirit of Chriſt or of God, in various modes of inſpiration, and on various occaſions, of which no mortal can be a competent judge. And in concluſion of what I ſhall at preſent advance on this head, it may be aſſerted in the truth and nature of things, that no government, in matters of eccleſiaſtical and civil concernment, can ſubſiſt, unleſs one or more perſons at the head of it ſhall be allowed a power to pronounce any law to be reaſonable, which is not and cannot be proved directly repugnant to reaſon, and to declare any doctrine to be a ſcriptural one, which is not and cannot be proved to be contrary to Holy Scripture.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER VI.

IN the preceding Chapter it was undertaken---1*ſt*, to anſwer objections againſt the reaſonableneſs and neceſſity of a ſubſcription, founded on a deſign to avoid diverſities of opinions, and to eſtabliſh a conſent touching true religion;--- 2*dly*, on its being ambiguous, who was principally concerned in a compilation of the articles, and what was particularly intended by doing ſo. In the preſent Chapter it is attempted to prove in the higheſt degree of probability, that Biſhop Jewel was principally concerned in a compilation of the articles, from a ſimilarity of ſentiment and expreſſion which will be found to occur in that little but moſt excellent treatiſe of Biſhop Jewel's, entitled An Apology for the eſtabliſhed Church of England; and here I deſign to treat of and to conſider the articles as religiouſly inſtructive, hiſtorically true, and politically right, ſubjoining to each of them ſuch animadverſions as ſhall be eſteemed moſt natural and pertinent.

ARTICLE 1. "There is but one living and true God, everlaſting; without body, parts, or paſſions; of infinite power, wiſdom,

dom and goodneſs ; the maker and preſerver of all things both viſible and inviſible. And in unity of this godhead there be three perſons of one ſubſtance, power, and eternity, the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghoſt."

This article is religiouſly inſtructive, and conſiſts of two propoſitions, which, like aphoriſms of a proverbial compoſition, may be conſidered as independent of each other ; the firſt is the foundation of natural religion, and the latter of the revealed religion of the Goſpel. The former part of the firſt propoſition, in which it is ſaid there is but one living and true God, was undoubtedly intended in conformity to the ſeveral revelations which God has been pleaſed to make of himſelf, both under the law and the goſpel, to contradict every ſpecies of idolatry, both antient and modern ; and it muſt be allowed to exhibit the moſt perfectly juſt and amiable deſcription of what are commonly called the natural and moral attributes of God : They are univerſally implied in the word Deus, in whatever part of Biſhop Jewel's apology it ſhall be found to occur. For ſince that book was was written purely on controverſial points of divinity, and ſince the firſt propoſition of this article never was and never can be

an

an object of controverſy amongſt the members of a chriſtian church, it was not likely to find it there in an equal number of terms, continued in a ſimilarity of expreſſion and ſentiment. And I ſhall conclude all animadverſions on the firſt propoſition of this article, with an argument to confute the common doctrine of atheiſm, concerning the poſſibility of an infinite and eternal ſucceſſion of cauſes. The bare aſſertion of an infinite and eternal ſucceſſion of cauſes, naturally alloweth, that there muſt be one eternal cauſe; now whatever cauſe was eternal could not poſſibly have exiſted in a ſucceſſion; an infinite, therefore, and eternal ſucceſſion of cauſes, is an abſurdity, or in terms is a plain and manifeſt contradiction.

But to confirm the truth of the ſecond propoſition, that in the unity of this Godhead there be three perſons of one ſubſtance, power, and eternity, the Father, Son, and the Holy-Ghoſt; ſince this is a point of controverſy, we have a plain and moſt intelligible account of Biſhop Jewel's trinitarian faith, in the following words: *Credimus unam quandam naturam, eſſe et vim divinam, quam appellamus Deum, eamque in tres perſonas æquales diſtinctam eſſe, in patrem,*

patrem, in filium, in ſpiritum ſanctum, ejuſdem omnes poteſtatis, ejuſdem majeſtatis, ejuſdem æternitatis, ejuſdem divinitatis, ejuſdem ſubſtantiæ. Et, quamvis tres illæ perſonæ ita diſtinctæ ſint, ut nec pater ſit filius, nec filius ſit ſpiritus ſanctus aut pater; Deum tamen eſſe unum, et illum unum creaſſe cælum, et terram, et omnia quæ cæli complexu continentur.

Now there is ſomething ſo conſanguineous between the terms of the ſecond propoſition of the firſt article, and of thoſe in the paſſage which I have here produced from the Apology, that in the year 1562 we may juſtly challenge the great Biſhop Jewel for its author. And ſince this great man, his obliged and judicious Hooker, the divine Smalridge, and the juſt reaſoning Stanhope, have declared as trinitarians, to believe, acknowledge, and worſhip, but one immenſe divine and eternal nature or godhead, though conſiſting of three diſtinct perſons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, they have juſtly excluded every ſuſpicion, imputation or charge of any ſpecies of idolatry, whatever the invidious and ſelf-confident arian has aſſerted to the contrary.

ARTICLE 2. "The Son which is the word of the Father, begotten from everlaſting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one ſubſtance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the Bleſſed Virgin, of her ſubſtance; ſo that two whole and perfect natures, that is to ſay, the godhead and manhood, were joined together in one perſon, never to be divided; whereof is one Chriſt, very God and very Man; who truly ſuffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his father to us, and to be a ſacrifice, not only for original guilt, but alſo for actual ſins of men."

In the Apology I find words to the ſame purport, and in the following order :--- *Credimus Jeſum Chriſtum filium unicum æterni patris; quemadmodum jam olim, ante omnia initia decretum fuerat, cum veniſſet plenitudo temporis, ſuſcepiſſe carnem et omnem naturam divinam, ex beata illa et pura virgine; utque in humano corpore perageret myſterium redemptionis noſtræ, et peccata noſtra et ſyngraphan illam quæ erat ſcripta contra nos, affigeret ad crucem. Eum credimus noſtra cauſâ eſſe mortuum, ſepultum, deſcendiſſe ad inferos, tertia die vi divina rediiſſe ad vitam et reſurrexiſſe. Et quamvis majeſtas et divinitas Chriſti ubique diffuſa ſit, tamen corpus*

ejus,

ejus, ut Auguſtinus ait, in uno loco eſſe oportere: Chriſtum corpori ſuo majeſtatem dediſſe, naturam tamen corporis non ademiſſe; neque ita aſſerendum eſſe Chriſtum Deum, ut eum negemus eſſe hominem: Utque ait martyr Virgilius Chriſtum humana ſua naturâ nos reliquiſſe, divinitate autem non reliquiſſe; eumque cum abſit a nobis per formam ſervi, tamen ſemper eſſe nobiſcum per formam dei.

Firſt. To reconcile to myſelf a ſubſcription to this article I would obſerve, that the words, in which it is ſaid that two whole and perfect natures, that is to ſay the godhead and manhood, were joined together in one perſon, never to be divided, whereof is one Chriſt very God and very Man, have a literal and grammatical conſtruction, and in oppoſition to what has been aſſerted by the Confeſſional, and by other adverſaries in general of our eſtabliſhed church, that they do exhibit a plain and intelligible propoſition; tho' the mode or manner in which things are declared to exiſt is not to be comprehended, nor is definible by human underſtandings; and this propoſition does naturally and neceſſarily ariſe from the certainty of a divine perſon's condeſcending, for particular reaſons, to come into and to act in the world in our human nature.

Secondly. When it is ſaid that he truly ſuffered, was crucified, dead and buried, they are matters of fact, which in the chriſtian world are uncontrovertible, and therefore can ſtand in need of no explication.

Thirdly. It is of the higheſt importance to conſider, that our original parents in paradiſe were rebels againſt the ſupreme will and authority of God; that every individual of their poſterity, when born into the world, is born with a propenſity or inclination to ſin, and that every individual which has lived to a mature age, in the character of ſinful creatures, muſt be juſtly chargeable with rebellion againſt the known will and acknowledged authority of God. And, therefore, when it is ſaid that Chriſt came into the world to reconcile his father to us, and to be a ſacrifice not only for original guilt, but for actual ſins, this ſurely muſt be a comfortable doctrine, being ſuch as every ſerious and conſiderate perſon muſt naturally wiſh to be true, and to have the truth of it confirmed by the authorities of a divine revelation.

In particular proof of the doctrine of the bleſſed trinity, I ſhall here mention the data which are taken from the reaſon and nature

nature of things, and from the Holy Scriptures of the New Teſtament, from whence this doctrine is naturally and pertinently deducible.

Firſt. Whatever is equal to two muſt be two, whatever is equal to three muſt be three, and whatever is equal to four muſt be four; and the ſame may juſtly be ſaid of any ſeries of numerical denominators or repreſentatives. And, in conſequence of this poſition, to be conceded from the reaſon and nature of things, ſince the Holy Scriptures of the New Teſtament have declared the Son and Holy Ghoſt equal to God, each of them muſt be God, and therefore we are obliged to believe, acknowledge, and adore, the three different perſons of the holy, bleſſed, and glorious trinity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt. In another view of things, in whatever perſons ſhall be allowed to exiſt all ſuch excellencies or perfections as are commonly aſcribed to God, each of them muſt be God; and the conſequence muſt naturally return to confirm the truth of the three different perſons of the holy trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.

Secondly. Let us now attend to certain

tain paſſages of Holy Scripture, which will afford the moſt direct and ſatisfactory evidences of our Saviour's divinity. It is plainly aſſerted, that he thought it no robbery to be equal with God, that God was manifeſted in the fleſh (*i.e.* in the humanity or human nature of Chriſt), Chriſt therefore muſt be God, in conformity to all the common proceſſes of logical argumentation. After his reſurrection, and not long before his reſolving to leave a moſt ignorant and ungrateful world, he commanded his diſciples to go and baptize all nations in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; nor is it any way credible that he would have ſo poſitively commiſſioned his diſciples to place God the Father in conjunction with the Son and the Holy Ghoſt, if there had been the leaſt inferiority in point of a divine eſtimation and dignity. When our Bleſſed Saviour had cured his diſciple Thomas of the unhappy diſorder of infidelity; and when, in conſequence of a conviction, he was firmly perſuaded that his ſame Lord and Maſter who had been lately crucified and had obtained a compleat victory over death and the grave by a reſurrection; the ſincerity of his faith is expreſſed in the following terms of the moſt humble

humble and penitent addreſs, *My Lord and my God.* Now the argument, in proof of our Saviour's divinity, ſtands briefly thus: If his Lord was his very and true God, and if his Lord was Chriſt, a matter of fact not to be contradicted, then Chriſt alſo muſt have been his very and true God.

This argument, in proof of our Saviour's divinity, is founded on a method of reaſoning, ſimilar to the common proceſſes of algebraic and mathematical demonſtration in the books of a Saunderſon, or an Euclid. And, in the laſt place, if we will only give an eaſy and common credit to what Chriſt has declared of himſelf; and ſuch a credit ſurely he hath a right to demand, ſince not through the efficacy of a delegated power, but by a power inherent in himſelf, he was able in the greateſt poſſible eaſe, and in a manner indiſcernible, ſo to increaſe, by a freſh creation, a few loaves and fiſhes, as to be ſufficient to ſatisfy the hunger of thouſands, when, in the common courſe of things, they were unequal to anſwer the eating demand of ten individuals; ſince he could walk upon the ſea in the ſame eaſe and ſecurity as upon dry land; ſince he could inſtantaneouſly alter, ſuſpend, or deſtroy, all the powers of nature, in making the

the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the dumb to ſpeak, the blind to ſee, the dead to riſe, and could give a reſurrection from the grave to his own body; all this ſurely implieth ſomething which nothing leſs than omnipotence itſelf could perform; and in whatever perſon omnipotence ſhall be allowed to reſide, it muſt be in conjunction with all other divine excellencies and perfections.

On a point directly applicable to the doctrine of the trinity, I ſhall here briefly attempt to anſwer the following enquiry or queſtion: If we have any ſcripture warrant for a direct addreſs of ſupplication, praiſe, and thankſgiving, either to the Son or to the Holy Ghoſt? For, in the opinion of the reviewers, it has been left in the ſame place in which it was found.

Firſt. Now, if the enquiry is an addreſs, as it ought to be to a trinitarian or to one who believes the doctrine of the trinity, it may be anſwered in the moſt deſirable degree of ſatisfaction; for the atheiſt muſt ſit indifferent to either ſide of the queſtion, and the arian will moſt ſurely determine it in the negative. That there is a ſcripture warrant of addreſs of ſupplication

eation and praiſe to God the Father muſt be a foundation point which no one can be ſuppoſed to diſpute. And ſince, from the authority of Holy Scripture, the Son and Holy Ghoſt are declared equal to the Father, and of conſequence muſt be conſidered as God, in either caſe, the obligation to an addreſs of ſupplication and thankſgiving muſt be equal. And let me obſerve, that there is an univerſal warrant from the Holy Scriptures to do every thing which the common ſenſe and reaſon of mankind ſhall pronounce to be reaſonable from a conſciouſneſs of dependence, and a principle of gratitude. And from theſe data the three following parts of a trinitarian's creed, which are thus expreſſed in our moſt excellent catechiſm, will give to this enquiry a moſt peremptory and concluſive deciſion: --- "*I believe in God the Father who hath made me and all the world, in God the Son who hath redeemed me and all mankind, and in God the Holy Ghoſt who hath ſanctified me and all the elect people of God.*" Whoever then, under the directions of common ſenſe, is fully perſuaded, that God the Father was the original author of his being and of all the neceſſary powers by which he ſubſiſts and is preſerved, muſt

think himſelf under an indiſpenſible obligation to offer him all pious and occaſional addreſſes of adoration, ſupplication, and praiſe.

Whoever again is fully convinced in his own mind, that God the Son is both willing and able, by ſome ſupernatural mode of operation, on things and on the minds of men, and of which ſupernatural mode of operation no mortal, without blaſphemy, can eſtabliſh himſelf a competent judge; whoever, I ſay, is fully convinced, that God the Son is both willing and able to continue and ſupport that church of true religion, of which, in the plenitude of divine power, he appointed himſelf the original preacher; whatever chriſtian alſo does firmly believe, that he is ineſtimably indebted to God the Son for the unexpected and undeſerved mercies of his ſalvation and redemption. If again it is an undeniable article of a chriſtian's creed, that God the Holy Ghoſt, in ſome particular and ſupernatural modes of operation, of which we can be no competent judges, did inſpire the Apoſtles with ſome præternatural gifts and abilities to preach that goſpel of true religion, which Chriſt himſelf had originally introduced and eſtabliſhed in the hearts of men;

men; and if chriſtians do believe, as they are divinely taught to do, that God the Holy Ghoſt is both willing and able, and will continue at all times, and upon various occaſions, in an incomprehenſible manner, to give a ſtrength and ability to our good deſigns and underſtandings, which, in the common courſe of things, we are not capacitated to acquire: From theſe articles of a chriſtian's faith there can be no doubt, but from a conſciouſneſs of dependence, and from motives of gratitude, we muſt have an univerſal warrant from the Holy Scriptures not only to preſent our pious and occaſional addreſſes to God the Father, but to God the Son, and to God the Holy Ghoſt*. As for my own part I

* The great and pious Milton, in conformity to the reaſonableneſs of offering occaſional addreſſes of ſupplication to God the Holy Ghoſt, does preſerve in our minds a lively ſenſe of this peculiar duty, by thus ſeriouſly and piouſly invoking the Holy Spirit in the following manner:

"*And chiefly thou, O Spirit! that doſt prefer*
"*Before all Temples th' upright Heart and pure,*
"*Inſtruct me—for thou know'ſt: Thou from the firſt*
"*Waſt preſent.*
——————"*What in me is dark,*
"*Illumine; what is low, raiſe and ſupport.*"

It is of great conſequence to obſerve alſo, on this point, that in our pious addreſſes to God the Father, to God the Son, and to God the Holy Ghoſt, they are preſented in three different offices or characters of action; for the word *perſona* is uſed in two different ſenſes; it ſignifieth a diſtinct perſon or being, as for inſtance: When Biſhop Jewel ſays, on

am content to receive, from the above quoted paſſages of Holy Scripture, this doctrine of the trinity, that three different or diſtinct perſons have exiſted from all eternity in one immenſe or infinite and eternal nature or godhead, without any free enquiry into the poſſible but incomprehenſible mode of their exiſtence: And I could wiſh that all the ancient and modern volumes of religious controverſy, which have been written on ſonſhips, on omouſian or eterouſian poſſibilities, could be deſtroyed by fire, and buried in oblivion. From hence I ſhall proceed to ſome brief conſideration and interpretation of the other articles, producing quotations from Biſhop Jewel's Apology, with a deſign to corroborate the credibility of his being principally concerned in throwing the articles into the preſent mode or form in which they are religiouſly and hiſtorically repreſented.

ARTICLE

on the doctrine of the trinity, *quamvis tres illæ perſonæ ita diſtinctæ ſint, ut nec pater ſit filius, nec filius ſit ſpiritus ſanctus aut pater.* And that the word *perſona* ſignifieth alſo a mere character or province of action, is evident from the following words of Tully, in his book of oratory: *Tres perſonas unus ſuſtineo, meam, adverſarii et judicis*; and this obſervation is fully and moſt directly confirmed from this part of our moſt excellent catechiſm, in which it is ſaid, "*I believe in God the Father who hath made me and all the world, in God the Son who hath redeemed me and all mankind, and in God the Holy Ghoſt who hath ſanctified me and all the elect people of God.*"

ARTICLE 3. "As Chriſt died for us and was buried, ſo alſo it is to be believed that he went down into hell."

Anſwering to the article before us are theſe: *Eum credimus noſtra cauſâ eſſe mortuum, ſepultum, deſcendiſſe ad inferos.*

According to a royal declaration, annexed to the articles, I am directed to underſtand them in that ſenſe which will ariſe from a literal and grammatical conſtruction of words, in the ſame manner as any intelligent reader is diſpoſed to interpret the Confeſſional, the writings of Clarke and Hoadley, or any other book whatſoever.

Firſt. Now the word *Hell* will anſwer to the Greek word ἅδης in the ſenſe in which Plato uſeth it in that remarkable part of his writings, commonly called his Phædo. In this ſenſe of the word *Hell* it ſignifieth that particular part of the univerſe, in which the ſoul of Socrates (whom Tully calls *divinus vir*) was ſuppoſed to be admitted upon its being diſſolved from the fetters of his fleſhly tabernacle. And ſince our Bleſſed Saviour declared to the thief upon the croſs that to day he ſhould be with him in paradiſe, the

the word *Hell* will anſwer to that particular part alſo of infinite ſpace, in which the human ſoul of Chriſt did reſide, in the intermediate ſpace of time, between that of his death and his reſurrection. Nor is my common ſenſe any way anxious about determining, what by the greateſt human ſagacity is not determinable, where the ſoul of Socrates does, or that of Chriſt did exiſt, before it was brought back, by an exertion of his own omnipotence, to that very ſame body, in which, free from all common diſorders of a ſinful creature, he had reſided for about three and thirty years. The word *Hell* therefore will anſwer, in a literal and grammatical conſtruction of words, to that place, or part of divine immenſity, in which the ſouls of good men, after death, do exiſt and are happy. Nor does a conſciouſneſs of my having ſubſcribed to this ſenſe of the word *Hell* give me the leaſt uneaſineſs or diſquietude of mind.

With this, I think, common ſenſe is, and ought to be ſatisfied; but the Confeſſional has ſaid more than enough about it to puzzle a man, or perplex an angel. But this doughty puritan does every where inſiſt upon it, that the church's ſenſe, and the ſenſe of an article, are always different

different from, and ſometimes contrary to each other; and therefore that a ſubſcription to any one of the thirty-nine articles, in a literal and grammatical ſenſe of the words in which it is expreſſed, is unjuſtifiable. I would here aſk this artful ſophiſt, If the church muſt ſtand for one, or a number of intelligent readers? For, unleſs where he is relating a bare matter of fact, he is the greateſt confuſer of common ſenſe, whoever thought himſelf qualified to defile white paper, or contaminate vellum. It is very certain, that the word State has equal pretenſions to read and underſtand as the word Church, and it is equally certain that neither of them can do either; ſo that this great man is prodigiouſly at a loſs how to account for dead and unintelligent things, wanting ability to conſtrue an article, a line in Homer, or a ſentence in Virgil. Let me inform the adverſaries of our eſtabliſhed church once more, that the church, in the year 1562, the members of the convocation, and the members of the national ſenate at that time, were one and the ſame; ſo that what the Church is now, can require no great ſagaciouſneſs to determine. And ſurely there can be nothing ænigmatical in this propoſition, that the ſtate's ſenſe of an act of parliament,

parliament, and the ſenſe of the act of parliament itſelf, are one and the ſame thing; and that the church's ſenſe of an article, and the ſenſe of the article itſelf, in a literal and grammatical conſtruction of the words in which it is exhibited, are equally related, as one confeſſional arian, or one confeſſional republican is to another; and in their preſent mood of diſcontent they are diſpoſed to vilify and depreciate every eccleſiaſtical and civil eſtabliſhment (an arian or republican one excepted), whether human or divine. In what ſenſe I muſt underſtand the words of Biſhop Jewel, *deſcendiſſe ad inferos*, is a point which I am not at all intereſted to ſettle, becauſe I have not ſubſcribed to the words of Biſhop Jewel's Apology, but to thoſe of an Engliſh article; and if Chriſt or his goſpel have a right to interpret it in their ſenſe of interpretation, which is conſiſtent with a literal conſtruction of words, I have ſubſcribed. The Confeſſional inſiſts upon it, that the word *inferos* muſt be referred to the unhappy ſpirits of what we call infernal regions, in a ſtate of puniſhment for their moſt flagrant ſins of ingratitude and rebellion. And whoever will read a few pages from the 164th of the Confeſſional, will find a labyrinth about the ſenſe of his church, and the

the ſenſe of an article, from whence there will be no probability of extricating himſelf, if he ſhould live to the indefinite age of the world. I would here obſerve, that no particular perſon, whether Hooker or Travers, Smalridge or Hoadley, Clarke or Waterland, have a right to place themſelves in the legiſlative dignity and authority of a Church. And I ſhall only add upon this unimportant point of religious controverſy, that if the articles ſhall be allowed fair play, being permitted to anſwer for themſelves, that to a trinitarian, and even to an arian, except two which clearly delineate the divinity of Chriſt and of the Holy Ghoſt, they may all be interpreted in a ſenſe, naturally ariſing from letters and grammar, which is perfectly conſonant both to reaſon and ſcripture.

ARTICLE 4. "Chriſt did truly riſe again from death, and took again his body, with fleſh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; wherewith he aſcended into heaven, and there ſitteth, until he return to judge all men at the laſt day."

APOL. *Tertia die vi divina rediiſſe ad vitam et reſurrexiſſe, poſt quadraginta dies,*

ſpectantibus diſcipulis aſcendiſſe in cœlum. Credimus Chriſtum rediturum eſſe ad exercendum publicum illum judicium, tam de illis quos inveniet adhuc in corpore ſuperſtites, quam de mortuis.

I do not know that this article ever was, or is, a matter of controverſy in the chriſtian world; nor can I conceive, that a conſciouſneſs of having ſubſcribed it, ſhould have given any poignant dart to the mind of a Lindſey or a Jebb: And the ſtrong ſimilitude which there is between the Engliſh article and this quotation from the Apology juſtly challenges the originality of its author.

ARTICLE 5th. "The Holy Ghoſt proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one ſubſtance, majeſty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God."

The truth of this article is implied in what was produced from the Apology, in reference to the ſecond propoſition of the firſt article, in the following words: — *Credimus unam quandam naturam eſſe, et vim divinam, quam appellamus Deum, eamque in tres perſonas æquales diſtinctam eſſe, in patrem,*

patrem, in filium, in ſpiritum ſanctum, ejuſdem omnes poteſtatis, ejuſdem majeſtatis, ejuſdem æternitatis, ejuſdem divinitatis, ejuſdem ſubſtantiæ. In another place it is ſaid, *Credimus ſpiritum ſanctum, qui eſt tertia perſona in ſacra Triade, illum verum eſſe Deum.*

This article, as Mr. Whiſton obſerves in his hiſtorical memoirs of the life and writings of Dr. Clarke, is readily and heartily ſubſcribed by all diſſenting anabaptiſts or quakers; nor can it be ſuppoſed to offend any mind but that of an arian or Whiſtonian caſt; and it was undoubtedly intended to exclude all arians from the miniſtry of our eſtabliſhed church.

ARTICLE 6. "Holy Scripture containeth all things neceſſary to ſalvation; ſo that whatſoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it ſhould be believed as ān article of the faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to ſalvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do underſtand thoſe canonical books of the Old and New Teſtament, of whoſe authority was never any doubt in the church. All the books of the New Teſtament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them canonical."

APOL. *Recipimus et amplectimur omnes canonicas ſcripturas, et veteris et novi teſtamenti; Deoque noſtro gratias agimus qui eam lucem nobis excitarit, quam ſemper haberemus in oculis ne vel humana fraude, vel inſidiis Dæmonum, ad errores et fabulas abduceremur: Eas eſſe cœleſtes voces per quas Deus voluntatem ſuam nobis pateſecerit: In illis ſolis poſſe hominum animos acquieſcere: In illis ea omnia quæcunque ad noſtram ſalutem ſint neceſſaria, ut origines, Auguſtinus, Chryſoſtomus, Cyrillus docuerunt, cumulate et plene contineri; eas eſſe vim et potentiam Dei ad ſalutem; eas eſſe fundamenta prophetarum et apoſtolorum, in quibus ædificata ſit Eccleſia; eas eſſe certiſſimam normam ad quam ea, ſi vacillet aut erret, poſſit exigi, ea ad quam omnis doctrina Eccleſiaſtica debeat revocari: Contra eas nec legem, nec traditionem, nec conſuetudinem ullam audiendam eſſe, ne ſi paulus quidem ipſe aut angelus de cælo veniat, et ſecus doceat.*

Though the truth of this ſixth article is univerſally allowed and aſſented to by proteſtant chriſtians, yet it is now, and has been a perpetual object of controverſy between proteſtants and papiſts. And therefore, upon this point his lordſhip is very full and honeſtly vehement. It has been, and

and is now erroneouſly and confidently aſſerted and maintained by the advocates for popery, that certain religious notions, opinions, or doctrines, of written and oral traditions, ought to be received with equal authority, as theſe which are clearly delivered in the Holy Scriptures themſelves. And, therefore, it is ſaid in this article, that whatever is not read therein, nor can be proved thereby, is not to be required of any one that it ſhould be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to ſalvation. And to the ſame purport, it is ſaid in the Apology: *Contra eas nec legem, nec traditionem, nec conſuetudinem ullam audiendam eſſe.*

Of ſo great importance is the truth of this article, that, in my opinion, no one ought to be admitted into the miniſtry of our eſtabliſhed church, without a ſubſcription *ex animo:* The two laſt words implying ſomething, which the Confeſſional, in an abſurd, indecent, and infidel turn, frequently makes the object of a ſneering raillery. Nor can a ſubſcription to the truth of an article any more affect the peace of mind, than a giving, to what a man knows to be true, a teſtimony upon oath in an open court of judicature.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE 7. "The Old Teſtament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Teſtament everlaſting life is offered to mankind by Chriſt, who is the only mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man; wherefore they are not to be heard which imagine, that the old fathers did look only for tranſitory promiſes; although the law given from God to Moſes, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind chriſtian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of neceſſity to be received in any common wealth, yet, notwithſtanding, no chriſtian man whatſoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."

This article is what I call religiouſly inſtructive, and contains ſix different propoſitions.

Firſt. That no fundamental doctrines of the Old Teſtament do contradict thoſe of the New.

Secondly. That both in the Old and New Teſtament everlaſting life is offered to mankind by Chriſt (*i. e.* by Chriſt in his divine perſon, or in the perſon of God).

Thirdly.

Thirdly. That Chriſt is the only mediator between God and Man.

Fourthly. That Chriſt was both God and Man.

Fifthly. That the ſacrificial and ceremonious parts of the law were diſannulled by the goſpel diſpenſation, or do not bind chriſtian men.

Sixthly. That the moral part of the law, called the Ten Commandments, are obligatory on chriſtians; or that no chriſtian man, whatſoever, is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

Theſe propoſitions are plain, and of ſo great importance, as to deſerve a place in the treaſure houſe of every one's memory who ſhall be admitted into the ſacred miniſtry of our eſtabliſhed church. And I could wiſh, that tutors, both in Oxford and Cambridge, would read a lecture, to all their pupils who are intended for holy orders, on the thirty-nine articles; making ſuch remarks or animadverſions on them as their good ſenſe and abilities ſhall ſuggeſt.

Five

Five of theſe ſix propoſitions are no objects of controverſy, and therefore nothing is to be met with in the Apology, which, in any one place, is directly ſimilar. And that which relates to the arian controverſy has been already conſidered.

ARTICLE 8. "The three creeds, the Nice Creed, Athanaſius' Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apoſtles Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by moſt certain warrants of Holy Scripture."

The divinity of Chriſt and of the Holy Ghoſt has been already proved from the Holy Scriptures, as confirmed by particular quotations from the Apology; and the ſingular manner in which the divinity of Chriſt is expreſſed in the Nicene and Athanaſian Creeds, was agreed on in a full and legal convocation of many pious, learned, and judicious divines, upon the firſt eſtabliſhment of chriſtianity, under the Emperor Conſtantine: And I may juſtly ſay, from the euſebian records of that age, that Euſebius and Alexander, the one Biſhop of Cæſarian Palaſtine, and the other of Alexandria, were equal in judgment and ſincerity to any of our moſt eminent and later

later divines, as I ſhall have occaſion hereafter to take under particular conſideration from this moſt valuable hiſtory. So that every trinitarian divine may readily and *ex animo*, or what I call heartily, ſubſcribe to this article.

ARTICLE 9. "Of original ſin: Original ſin ſtandeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk, but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteouſneſs, and is of his own nature inclined to evil; ſo that the fleſh luſteth always againſt the ſpirit; and, therefore, in every perſon born into this world, it deſerveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the luſt of the fleſh, called in greek φρονημα σαρκος, which ſome expound the wiſdom, ſome ſenſuality, ſome the affection, ſome the deſire of the fleſh, is not ſubject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apoſtle doth confeſs, that concupiſcence and luſt hath of itſelf the nature of ſin."

The particular doctrines of original ſin, of free will, of juſtification, of predeſtination and election, are ſcriptural doctrines, do frequently occur, are particularly delivered and enforced in the epiſtolary writings of the New Teſtament.

Firſt. And I would obſerve, that the ſcriptural ſenſe, in which theſe doctrines were underſtood by the Apoſtles, muſt be agreeable to reaſon and to the moral attributes of God.

Secondly. That we ought to interpret theſe doctrines, in the articles, in the ſame ſenſe in which every chriſtian is ſuppoſed to underſtand them, as contained in the Holy Scriptures.

Thirdly. That the literal and grammatical conſtruction of words, in which theſe doctrines are expreſſed in the articles, will admit of the ſame ſcriptural ſenſe in which he is ſuppoſed to underſtand them, as agreeable to reaſon and to the moral attributes of God. And of conſequence this ſufficiently juſtifies a compilation of theſe articles, and a demand to have them ſubſcribed by every one who is to be admitted into the miniſtry of our eſtabliſhed church.

Fourthly.

Fourthly. Original guilt, the conſequence of original ſin, is mentioned in the ſecond article, and we are declared to be exempted from the ill effects of it, through the particular efficacy of that ſacrifice which Chriſt is ſaid to have made of himſelf on the croſs.

Fifthly. By original ſin I mean the ſeed of inclinations, which is ſuppoſed to commence with the firſt period of our exiſtence, to impure and unlawful pleaſures, and conſidering ourſelves as ſubjects of the ſupreme government of God, in various inſtances, to act wickedly and diſobediently. And this ſeed of inclinations, or ſuch inclinations themſelves, are declared objects of divine diſpleaſure and wrath; and in the ſenſe of a word which is more harſh and ſevere, they are declared objects of damnation.

Sixthly. Biſhop Burnet, a learned and judicious expoſitor of our articles, in his expoſition of this ninth article, placeth the pelagians in company with the ſocinians; but Biſhop Jewel has joined them in alliance with the donatiſts, as is evident from the following paſſage: *Ad hunc modum olim ſine concilio generali ſtatim domi privata*

diſceptatione occurſum eſt pelagianis et donatiſtis. Biſhop Jewel is here writing of the great deference and authority which is due to a general council, and in this place does evidently inſinuate, that any religious doctrine which was agreed on by the antient chriſtian pelagians and donatiſts in their private conventicles, ought not to be received with equal credit as that which is the determination of a general council. And what Biſhop Jewel has advanced on this and a few other ſubſequent articles, may be clearly gathered from the following quotation: ----

"*Dicimus hominem natum eſſe in peccato, et in peccato vitam agere, neminem poſſe vere dicere mundum eſſe cor ſuum; juſtiſſimum quemque ſervum eſſe inutilem: Legem Dei perfectam eſſe, et a nobis requirere perfectam et plenam obedientiam: Neque eſſe mortalium quenquam qui poſſit in conſpectu Dei propriis viribus juſtificari; itaque unicum receptum noſtrum et perfugium eſſe ad miſericordiam patris noſtri per Jeſum Chriſtum, ut certo animis noſtris perſuadeamus eſſe propitiationem pro peccatis noſtris; ejus ſanguine omnes labes noſtras deletas eſſe: Illum pacificaſſe omnia ſanguine crucis ſuæ, illum unica illa hoſtia quam ſemel obtulit in cruce, omnia perfeciſſe,*

et

et ea causâ, cum animam ageres, dixit, consummatum est: Quasi significare vellet, persolutum jam esse pretium pro peccato humani generis. Quamvis autem dicamus nihil nobis esse præsidii in operibus et factis nostris et omnem salutis nostræ rationem constituamus in solo Christo, non tamen ea causâ dicimus laxe et solute vivendum esse, quasi tingi tantum et credere, satis sit homini christiano, et nihil ab eo aliud expectetur: Vera fides viva est, nec potest esse otiosa.

Seventhly. The nature and truth of original sin are founded on the following passages of Holy Scripture: In the fifth Psalm, and in the second chapter of Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, and on many other similar passages. In the fifth Psalm it is said, *I was shapen in wickedness, and in sin hath my mother conceived me:* From whence I understand, that we are shapen, in the very beginning of our existence, in the womb and in the loins of sinful creatures; that inclinations to unlawful pleasures and sinful practices do commence with the beginning of our bodily, carnal, and fleshly nature; that such inclinations, even before they are brought into action, being clearly seen in the foreknowledge of God, are said to be objects of

of his diſpleaſure or wrath; are ſaid to have the nature of ſin, and are ſtiled original ſin; for which reaſon St. Paul obſerves, that we are by nature children of wrath. And, that we may clearly underſtand the whole of this article, it is neceſſary to obſerve, that the words *fleſh* and *ſpirit* are evidently placed in the epiſtolary writings of the New Teſtament, in direct oppoſition to each other; and that what is called by St. Paul the luſt of concupiſcence, is uſed in a bad ſenſe; ſo that univerſally whatever, in a moral view of things, is the object of any ſcriptural word or phraſe, which is uſed in a bad ſenſe, is ſaid to have the nature of ſin, and to be an object of the diſpleaſure and wrath of God. From theſe preliminary obſervations I ſhall proceed to give this brief and paraphraſtical interpretation of this ninth article, being ſuch as the literal and grammatical ſenſe of the words, in which it is expreſſed, will fairly admit of.

"Original ſin ſtandeth not in the following of Adam, or in acting the ſame ſins which Adam was guilty of, as the pelagians do vainly talk or have falſely aſſerted, but is the fault and corruption of the nature, or does proceed from the carnal nature of every man

that

that is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteouſneſs, or from that original ſtate of purity and uprightneſs in which our firſt parents were created before the fall, and is of his own nature inclined to evil; ſo that the fleſh luſteth always againſt the ſpirit, and therefore in every perſon born into the world it deſerveth God's wrath and damnation: And this corruption of nature, or the evil inclinations of our carnal nature, doth remain, yea, even in thoſe that are regenerated, or even in chriſtians themſelves; whereby the luſt of the fleſh, called in greek φρονημα σαρκος, which ſome expound the wiſdom, ſome ſenſuality, ſome the affection, ſome the deſire of the fleſh, is not ſubject, or is not always in ſubjection to the laws of God; and though there is no condemnation or abſolute condemnation for them, or for chriſtians that believe and are baptized, yet the Apoſtle doth confeſs, or in a moral ſenſe doth confeſs or declare, that concupiſcence and luſt hath of itſelf the nature of ſin, and of conſequence is an object of divine diſpleaſure and wrath."

This article then deſerves to be made an important doctrine of chriſtian divinity, by reaſon

reaſon of its having a plain practical meaning, which eaſily ariſeth from a proper diſtinction between the contrary reaſons or motives to action, belonging to the carnal and ſpiritual parts of humanity, agreeable to the ſcriptural words and phraſes of the Old and New Teſtament, and eſpecially to this ſcriptural declaration of St. Paul, *If ye live after the fleſh, ye ſhall die; but if ye, through the ſpirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye ſhall live.* It being neceſſary to obſerve, that life and death, in the epiſtolary writings of the New Teſtament, ſignify, on one ſide, the puniſhment of ſin and diſobedience, but on the other, the reward of virtue and obedience: That to live after the fleſh implieth an unlawful gratification of the inclinations, deſires, appetites, and paſſions of our carnal nature; but to live after the ſpirit, in mortifying the deeds of the body, implieth a virtuous and pious courſe of living by the dictates of ſober reaſon, by the principles of chriſtian faith, and by the ſupernatural influences of grace.

ARTICLE 10. "Of free-will: The condition of man, after the fall of Adam, is ſuch, that he cannot turn and prepare himſelf by his own natural ſtrength and good

good works to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works pleaſant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God preventing us that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will."

Firſt. For a right underſtanding of this article I ſhall here produce a particular paſſage of the learned and pious Biſhop Burnet, in his preface to the expoſition of the articles; and I may juſtly add, that it deſerves to be particularly attended to by every well diſpoſed chriſtian: ---When all parties, ſays he, acknowledge that God is the ſovereign Lord of the univerſe, that he governs by a providence from which nothing is hid and to which nothing can reſiſt, and that he is likewiſe holy and juſt, true and faithful, merciful and gracious, in all his ways; thoſe who agree about all this ſhould not differ, though they cannot fall into the ſame methods of reconciling theſe together: And if they do all agree to bleſs God for all the good that they either do, or receive, and to accuſe themſelves for all the ill that they either do or ſuffer: If they agree that they ought to be humble, and to miſtruſt their

own ſtrength, to pray earneſtly to God for aſſiſtance, and to depend on him, to truſt to him, and likewiſe to employ their own faculties with all poſſible care and diligence in the cleanſing their hearts, and governing their words and actions: Here the great truths of both ſides are ſafe; every thing that has an influence on practice is agreed on; though neither ſide can meet in the ſame ways of joining all theſe together.

Secondly. I have always thought, that if the doctrines of grace, election, juſtification, and predeſtination, are applied in proper caſes and on particular occaſions, that notwithſtanding, about things of this nature, our diſſenting lutherans and calviniſts are daily abuſing, reproaching, and reprobating one another, they have a plain and intelligible meaning, conſiſtent with the moral attributes or with the goodneſs and juſtice of God. And Biſhop Jewel, with a few leading and dictating members of the convocation, in the year 1562, did cautiouſly and wiſely reſolve to expreſs this article and a few others of the ſame nature, in ſcriptural words and phraſes, that no one ſhould attempt to interpret them in a ſenſe different from that in which they are delivered

delivered in the Scriptures, as perfectly conſonant to the goodneſs and juſtice of God; for it muſt not be ſuppoſed that Almighty God ever did or will act in contradiction to himſelf. But Mr. Burnet, I am ſorry to obſerve, is on this article moſt metaphyſically obſcure, unintelligible, and unedifying; having given us ſome large ſlices of his Scotch and groſly predeſtinating divinity. Nor does he appear to me to have any clear idea of the difference between a ſemi or an whole pelagian.

Thirdly. That we may rightly underſtand this article, it is neceſſary to conſider the different ſenſes in which the word *prevent* is commonly uſed, and to conſider the nature of a ſcriptural preventing grace, as illuſtrated by particular facts which ſtand upon the hiſtorical records of the New Teſtament.

Firſt. In a common acceptation of the word *prevent* it implieth one perſon's hindering another from putting any particular deſign into execution; but, in a ſcriptural ſenſe of the word, it ſignifieth the previouſly doing ſomething in order to bring any good deſign into execution, as is plain from this well known religious expreſſion,

Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings, with thy moſt gracious favour; and from hence the nature of a ſcriptural preventing grace will be conſpicuouſly underſtood from the following inſtances: How this preventing grace was exerciſed by the Holy Ghoſt on the minds of the Apoſtles, as a means of inclining them to accept the divine call of Chriſt, to renounce all their worldly connections and employments, relying entirely on his providence for a daily preſervation and ſubſiſtence? How this preventing grace was exerciſed, as previous to a preaching the Goſpel in different languages, for communicating ſuch to the Apoſtles as they had never ſtudied, and for enabling them to ſpeak with all neceſſary readineſs and fluency? And laſtly, How by this præternatural operation of grace St. Paul did reſolve within himſelf to renounce judaiſm, and to become a ſtrenuous advocate for the religion of chriſtianity; and how, in a moral view of things, he was by this means convinced of having acted unreaſonably and wickedly in depriving his fellow creatures of liberty, property, and even life itſelf, for only preaching a different religion. How ſuch a divine and preventing grace could be exerciſed on the minds of men, conſiſtent with

with the powers of free agency, and with men's being accountable for their actions, is ſurely ſomething not fathomable by the line of human underſtandings, though the matters of fact on which the truth of it is founded are not to be reſiſted.

Secondly. The plain doctrine alſo of this article does evidently reſult from this declaration of St. Paul's, in the ſecond chapter of his Epiſtle to the Philippians, *It is God*, ſays he, *which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleaſure*. In the preceding verſe he exhorts his chriſtian brethren to work out their ſalvation with fear and trembling (*i. e.* endeavour to do all good and pious actions neceſſary to ſalvation, in a ſpirit of diffidence of your own endeavours, and the preventing grace of God will co-operate with your ſpirit for cauſing you to will and to do what your chriſtian ſalvation does require). And from hence I ſhall interpret the article under immediate conſideration, even in its literal and grammatical ſenſe, in the following manner.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is ſuch, or the condition of man is ſuch, that he cannot turn and prepare himſelf

himſelf by his own natural ſtrength to faith and calling upon God; or that, without the operation of a divine and preventing grace, he cannot, in the natural courſe of his own thoughts and reſolutions, do the duties of a right faith in God; wherefore, we have no power to do good works pleaſant and acceptable to God, or that our natural ſtrength of reſolution is inſufficient to do good works pleaſant and acceptable to God without the grace of God preventing us that we may have a good will or a will to do our duty, and even working or co-operating with us when we have this good will. This article contains a doctrine of the higheſt importance to our entertaining right notions of the ſuperintending providence of God, in co-operating with the good deſires and reſolutions of men by a preventing grace, in order to bring men to happineſs and ſalvation. And I may add, that upon the principles of chriſtianity this co-operating and preventing grace of God is not confined to men of any age and country.

ARTICLE II. "Of the juſtification of man: We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, by faith, and not for

for our works or deſervings; wherefore, that we are juſtified by faith only is a moſt wholeſome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expreſſed in the homily of juſtification."

That the mind of Biſhop Jewel was chiefly employed in a compilation of this article, may be reaſonably gathered from the following part of his Apology: *Legem Dei eſſe perfectam, et a nobis requirere perfectam et plenam obedientiam, neque eſſe mortalium quenquam qui poſſit in conſpectu Dei propriis viribus juſtificari; itaque unicum receptum noſtrum et perfugium eſſe ad miſericordiam patris noſtri per Jeſum Chriſtum.*

Firſt. The two methods of falſe reaſoning, which have been made uſe of on this ſubject by our diſſenting lutherans and calviniſts, ſtand briefly thus: The one ſays, that good works are neceſſary to ſalvation, and therefore by good works only we are ſaved. The other ſays, that faith is neceſſary to ſalvation, and therefore by faith only we are ſaved. But, in both caſes, a falſe concluſion is drawn from given premiſes; and our conventicle doctors are wrong on both ſides of the queſtion; for we are not ſaved by good works only

only, nor by faith, but by the concurring efficacy of both. The words *juſtification* and *ſalvation*, and the phraſes to be juſtified and to be ſaved are frequently mentioned in the Holy Scriptures of the New Teſtament, but it is not neceſſary to take into conſideration in what ſenſe they ought to be underſtood in the ſeveral places in which they occur; becauſe this doctrine of juſtification or ſalvation is determined by the literal and grammatical ſenſe of the article in which it is expreſſed: And, rightly to underſtand this moſt important doctrine of juſtification or ſalvation, it is requiſite to attend to what our Bleſſed Saviour has declared in his dividing mankind into the oppoſite characters of good and bad, or of the righteous and the wicked; and in his pronouncing the one to be, but the other not to be, objects of ſalvation. Though in his unexpected and undeſerved mercy he has propoſed a particular condition, upon which both are declared objects of ſalvation; and therefore he is ſaid, in Scripture Language, to be a propitiation and ſacrifice for the ſins of the whole world. So that even good men, meaſuring their moral ſtate by the rule of perfect obedience, muſt, in the character of ſinful creatures, acknowledge themſelves

themſelves liable to ſuch puniſhments as infinite juſtice ſhall demand. But through the merits of Chriſt, by faith, we are graciouſly promiſed a remiſſion of ſins, or a remiſſion of all external puniſhments due to diſobedience and ſin; and therefore, in Scripture Language, we have obtained a gracious promiſe of being juſtified and ſaved. So that from obſervations of this nature, I ſhall give the following brief and paraphraſtical interpretation of the article before us, as entirely diſengaged from the errors of lutherans, and the entanglements of calviniſts.

We are accounted righteous before God only, or we ſhall be ſaved only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt by faith, and not for our works or deſervings of a perfect obedience; wherefore, that we are juſtified by faith only, or that we are juſtified by faith with the concurring efficacy of an imperfect obedience, is a moſt wholeſome doctrine, and very full of comfort.

Perhaps the Confeſſional, the ſole buſineſs of whoſe performance is to cavil, quibble and trifle, improving trifling differences of opinion into the moſt impor-

tant objections, will ſay, that this article cannot be ſubſcribed without ſubſcribing alſo the homily of juſtification; but we may juſtly anſwer, that when one and the ſame doctrine is expreſſed in two books, and one only is required to be ſubſcribed, it is not neceſſary that both ſhould be read and ſubſcribed. Perhaps, again, a free inquirer will be arbitrarily inclined to aſk, why the merits of Chriſt by faith ſhould be made a neceſſary condition of ſalvation? We anſwer, that we receive it, as his Lordſhip has piouſly declared, for a wholeſome doctrine, and full of comfort; nor do we think ourſelves at liberty to aſk a reaſon without juſtly incurring the imputation of arrogance and blaſphemy. Wherefore, ſince comfortably I received, with readineſs I have ſubſcribed it.

ARTICLE 12. "Of good works: Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith and follow after juſtification, cannot put away our ſins, and endure the ſeverity of God's judgments, yet are they pleaſing and acceptable to God in Chriſt, and do ſpring out neceſſarily of a true and lively faith, inſomuch, that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree diſcerned by the fruit."

Firſt.

Firſt. Who was principally concerned in a compilation of this article is more than highly probable from an eaſy interpretation of theſe words of Biſhop Jewel's Apology, *Vera fides viva eſt, nec poteſt eſſe otioſa.*

Secondly. By a chriſtian faith I mean a faith in the divinity of Chriſt as the true Meſſiah, and in the natural and moral attributes of God, as rules of action and conduct to every individual, conſidered as one of the creatures, children, and ſubjects of God's ſupreme Government; for which reaſon the good actions or works of a good man, or of a good character, muſt be the natural and inſeparable attendants of a chriſtian faith; and this confirms our interpretation of the preceding article, where it is ſaid, that we are juſtified only by faith, or by faith in concurrence with the good works of a good man, which are its inſeparable attendants.

Thirdly. It is certain, that all acts of divine juſtice and goodneſs, which are implied in the words *damnation*, *juſtification*, and *ſalvation*, cannot commence till after a diſſolution of our ſpiritual from the corporeal part of humanity; becauſe there is no part of healthy life in which a good man

may not become wicked, and in which a wicked man may not repent and reform, and from the Holy Scriptures receive the moſt comfortable aſſurances of juſtification or ſalvation.

Fourthly. The word *juſtification* in this article is uſed in a peculiar ſenſe, ſignifying a man's being converted to and baptized into a chriſtian faith from a ſtate of idolatry or judaiſm.

Fifthly. Even the beſt of chriſtians can, and do pay only an imperfect obedience, are therefore to be eſteemed ſinful creatures, and in this character muſt have ſins to anſwer for, and conſequently cannot endure the ſeverity of God's judgments, or are liable to ſuch future puniſhments, as in the determinations of ſtrict juſtice may be required and inflicted. From hence this article, even in its literal and grammatical ſenſe, will admit of the following interpretation.

Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, or of a chriſtian faith, and follow after juſtification, or after a man's being converted to and baptized into a chriſtian faith, and after having received the

the moſt comfortable aſſurances of a final juſtification, cannot put away our ſins, and conſequently have no right in ourſelves to be exempted from future puniſhments, yet are they, or ſuch good works as proceed from a chriſtian faith, are pleaſing and acceptable to God in Chriſt, and do ſpring out neceſſarily, or ſuch good works do naturally ſpring out of a true and lively faith, inſomuch, that by them a lively faith, or as Biſhop Jewel calls it, *viva fides*, may be as evidently known as a tree diſcerned by the fruit.

ARTICLE 13. "Of works before juſtification: Works done before the grace of Chriſt, and the inſpiration of his ſpirit, are not pleaſant to God, foraſmuch as they ſpring not of faith in Jeſu Chriſt, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or, as the ſchool authors ſay, deſerve grace of congruity: Yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of ſin."

If the ſenſe of this article is applied as it ought to be to thoſe who in the Apoſtles time were converted from judaiſm or idolatry to the chriſtian faith, and who had been

been properly commiſſioned to bear a part in the chriſtian miniſtry; or if the ſenſe of this article is applied to thoſe who in any ſucceeding age of the world ſhall be converted from a falſe to the true religion of Chriſt, it has a plain, intelligible, and important meaning, and may be thus interpreted.

Works done before the grace of Chriſt and the inſpiration of his ſpirit, or good works done before a converſion to the chriſtian faith, and before the gifts of a chriſtian inſpiration had been received, are not pleaſant to God; foraſmuch as they did and could not ſpring of faith in Chriſt, nor, with regard to idolaters, from a faith in the true God whom Chriſt preached; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or good works done from falſe motives cannot make men worthy objects of chriſtian grace, yea, rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done; or, ſince ſuch good works are done in a wrong faith of judaiſm and idolatry, we doubt not but they have the nature of ſin; or we doubt not but all good works or actions, proceeding from a wrong faith, are diſagreeable and offenſive to God, though

though they are not equally deſerving of wrath and puniſhment as wicked and immoral actions.

The plain ſenſe then of this article, and the conſequence naturally deducible from it, is this: That good chriſtians will be entitled to greater privileges, or to larger diſpenſations of divine love and favour in a future ſtate of exiſtence, than good jews and heathens, or thoſe who have lived and died in the profeſſion of a falſe religion: And in this view of things the article before us is plain and of the higheſt importance, deſerving to be received amongſt the fundamental doctrines of chriſtianity.

ARTICLE 14th. "Of works of ſupererogation: Voluntary works, beſides, over and above God's Commandments, which they call works of ſupererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: For by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his ſake than of bounden duty is required; whereas Chriſt ſaith plainly, when ye have done all that are commanded to you, ſay, we are unprofitable ſervants."

In

In oppoſition to this doctrine of ſupererogation, as maintained by the Church of Rome, we find this paſſage in the Apology: — *Hominem natum eſſe in peccato, et in peccato vitam agere, neminem poſſe vere dicere mundum eſſe cor ſuum, juſtiſſimum quemque ſervum eſſe inutilem.*

Firſt. Works of ſupererogation may be conſidered as a privilege of the catholic or univerſal Church of Rome; from a ſtrange overflowing ciſtern of holineſs and ſufficiency, the head of this church, as Biſhop Jewel has proved from their own hiſtories, is called in Latin *Dominus Dominantium*, or in Engliſh *Lord of Lords*, claiming a right of diſpenſing pardons, abſolutions, and indulgencies, at all times, and upon any conditions, not preſcribed by the religion, nor circumſcribed by the authority of Chriſt. But the Church of England, in conformity to the viſible ſtate of human nature, and to repeated declarations of Holy Scripture, does truly and humbly acknowledge, that the beſt of men are ſinful creatures, and of conſequence that the beſt ſervices of the beſt of men can amount to no more than to the deſervings of an imperfect obedience, agreeable to the latter part of this article, in which it is ſaid, that

that when ye have done all that are commanded to you, ſay, we are unprofitable ſervants.

ARTICLE 15. "Of Chriſt alone, without ſin: Chriſt in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, ſin only except, from which he was clearly void both in his fleſh and in his ſpirit. He came to be a lamb without ſpot, who, by ſacrifice of himſelf once made, ſhould take away the ſins of the world, and ſin, as St. John ſaith, was not in him. But all we the reſt, although baptized and born again in Chriſt, yet offend in many things; and if we ſay that we have no ſin, we deceive ourſelves and the truth is not in us."

Firſt. I would obſerve, that the doctrine of regeneration hath no meaning but when applied to chriſtian converts in the firſt ages of chriſtianity, who were converted from judaiſm and idolatry to the chriſtian faith, or, in a moral view of things, to that change of ſpiritual condition which belongeth to the repentance and reformation of notorious ſinners, or of thoſe who by our Bleſſed Saviour are taken into the number of the wicked, in oppoſition to

thoſe who are called the righteous. For, with regard to all chriſtians, who have been born of chriſtian parents, have been regularly baptized and educated in the principles of chriſtianity, to talk of a regeneration in ſuch chriſtians, as neceſſary to ſalvation, is apparently abſurd and ridiculous. From hence I ſhall proceed thus to interpret this article in a manner agreeable to the literal and grammatical ſenſe of words in which it is expreſſed.

Chriſt in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, ſin only except, or Chriſt in his human nature was a man undefiled or uncontaminated with any ſinful deſires, inclinations, and practices whatſoever, from which he was clearly void both in his fleſh and in his ſpirit. But all we the reſt, or we the Apoſtles and other good chriſtians, although baptized and born again in Chriſt, or although from a ſtate of judaiſm and idolatry have been baptized and have had our ſouls regenerated with the great and ſaving truths of Chriſt's new religion, yet we, or we all, offend in many things, and if we ſay that we have no ſin we deceive ourſelves and the truth is not in us.

The

The latter part of this article was evidently deſigned alſo to expoſe the Romiſh doctrine of ſupererogation, as unſcriptural and abſurd. And this article contains a few propoſitions, which are plain and eſſential parts of chriſtianity, deſerving to be received and ſubſcribed by every miniſter of our eſtabliſhed church.

ARTICLE 16. "Of ſin after baptiſm: Not every deadly ſin, willingly committed after baptiſm, is ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt and unpardonable; wherefore, the grant of repentance is not to be denied to ſuch as fall into ſin after baptiſm. After we have received the Holy Ghoſt we may depart from grace given, and fall into ſin, and by the grace of God we may ariſe again and amend our lives; and, therefore, they are to be condemned which ſay, they can no more ſin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveneſs to ſuch as truly repent."

Firſt. From the firſt propoſition of this article, not every deadly ſin, willingly committed after baptiſm, is ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt and unpardonable, I would obſerve, that ſin is declared in the epiſtolary writings of the New Teſtament as the

cauſe of death and puniſhment; for all ſin excepted, a deſign to inflict puniſhment can have no exiſtence; and becauſe ſin is the cauſe alſo of death: This conſideration alone ſufficiently juſtifies the compiler of this article, in giving to the word ſin the adjective appellation of deadly.

Secondly. Since every ſin, conſidered as an object of puniſhment, muſt be acknowledged by the offender to be repugnant to the laws of God's ſupreme government; this alſo evidently juſtifies the phraſe of *ſin willingly committed.* And when connected with the words *after baptiſm*, it may be ſaid to give birth to a doctrine which is frequently enforced by the Apoſtles in the epiſtolary writings of the New Teſtament, is applied to themſelves, and to all adult converts to the chriſtian faith, from the different and contrary religions of judaiſm and idolatry. But it has another meaning, and will eaſily admit of an application of it to every one born of chriſtian parents, baptized and regularly educated in the doctrines and principles of a chriſtian faith, and, when grown to years of maturity, accountable for their actions at the preſent and future tribunals of God and Conſcience. In this ſenſe of the words *after baptiſm*

baptiſm it was undoubtedly intended; and in this we are moſt materially, if not ſolely, intereſted.

Thirdly. The doctrine which ariſeth from the following words of this article, *after we have received the Holy Ghoſt we may depart from grace given, and fall into ſin,* is founded on what St. Paul declares in the 4th, 5th, and 6th verſes of the 6th chapter of his Epiſtle to the Hebrews. For it is impoſſible, or it may be rendered, for it is ſcarce poſſible, for thoſe who were once enlightened, and have taſted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghoſt, and have taſted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they ſhall fall away to renew them again to repentance; ſeeing they crucify to themſelves the Son of God afreſh, and put him to an open ſhame. From hence the Apoſtle allows the poſſibility of a man's departing from grace given, and of falling into ſin after he hath received the Holy Ghoſt; or that after a perſon, in the firſt age of chriſtianity, had been baptized into the chriſtian faith, and had received ſome viſible gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, or in an application of it to ourſelves, after a perſon has been baptized and educated

educated in the principies of a chriſtian faith, he may depart from grace given, and fall into ſin; and from the daily facts of experience, and from various paſſages in the New Teſtament, the good Biſhop Jewel has declared alſo, that by the grace of God we may ariſe again and amend our lives. From hence this article, even in its literal ſenſe, has a meaning very conſpicuous and equally important.

Not every deadly ſin willingly committed after baptiſm, or after a perſon has been baptized, religiouſly educated in the principles of a chriſtian faith, and is become accountable for his actions, is a ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and unpardonable: Wherefore, the grant of repentance is not to be denied to ſuch as fall into ſin after baptiſm; or baptized and good chriſtians, with all their ſins of an imperfect obedience, may be allowed to live in an habitual ſtate of ſaving repentance. After we have received the Holy Ghoſt, we may depart from grace given, and fall into ſin; or any individual chriſtian, even an Apoſtle, or a baptized infant, grown to years of maturity, after having received the Holy Ghoſt or grace, being both of the ſame import, for the Holy Ghoſt or grace is declared in Holy Scripture

Scripture to attend or to be conferred upon the act of chriſtian baptiſm; ſo that ſuch perſons may depart from grace, falling, in many inſtances and upon many occaſions, into ſinful actions, contrary to the nature and dictates of the Holy Ghoſt or of grace; and by the grace of God, or by the ordinary means of grace, we may ariſe again and amend our lives, or we may be brought by the grace of God, or by the ordinary means of grace, or any individual chriſtian may be brought to a ſincere repentance of his ſins, and to the keeping good reſolutions to amend or to avoid them in the ſucceeding part of life. And therefore they are to be condemned which ſay, they can no more ſin as long as they live here; or they do contradict the plain ſenſe of Holy Scripture who ſay, that, by virtue of grace conferred at the act of baptiſm, or by grace annexed to a chriſtian faith, they can do no ſinful action, but are enabled to pay a perfect obedience; and they alſo are to be condemned, or do contradict the doctrines of Holy Scripture, who deny forgiveneſs to ſuch as truly repent, or who deny that ſinners may be comfortably aſſured of divine pardon and acceptance upon a ſincere and hearty repentance.

It is highly probable, from this part of the article, under immediate conſideration, *that they are to be condemned which ſay, they can no more ſin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveneſs to ſuch as truly repent*, that Biſhop Jewel, who was well verſed in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, might ſecretly allude to certain falſe doctrines which had been broached and propagated by the pelagians, donatiſts, novations, gnoſtics, and by others in the primitive ages of chriſtianity: For even in the Apoſtolic age itſelf falſe or unſcriptural doctrines were maintained with virulence, contrary to the genuinely pure and divine ſpirit of the Goſpel. Nor is it leſs probable, that his lordſhip, who was principally concerned in compiling theſe articles, might alſo ſecretly allude from theſe words, *that they can no more ſin as long as they live here*, to the unſcriptural doctrine of Engliſh puritans in his own time; becauſe theſe words do exactly correſpond to our idea and definition of puritaniſm, and to that exorbitant ſpirit of ſelf-ſufficiency, from whence the word *puritan* was evidently and originally born. And becauſe for want of rightly underſtanding the words *juſtification*, *regeneration*, *election*, *predeſtination*, and *grace*, in that true ſenſe in which they were delivered

vered by the Apoſtles, many primitive and modern chriſtians had advanced certain falſe doctrines, it was therefore neceſſary that particular articles ſhould be compiled, in which true and ſcriptural doctrines of the ſame nature ſhould be expreſſed, ſeriouſly attended to, and ſubſcribed by the legally ordained miniſters of our eſtabliſhed church.

ARTICLE 17. "Of predeſtination and election: Predeſtination to life is the everlaſting purpoſe of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath conſtantly decreed by his counſel, ſecret to us, to deliver from curſe and damnation thoſe whom he hath choſen in Chriſt out of mankind, and to bring them by Chriſt to everlaſting ſalvation, as veſſels made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued with ſo excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpoſe by his ſpirit working in due ſeaſon; they, through grace, obey the calling; they be juſtified freely; they be made ſons of God by adoption; they be made like the image of his only begotten ſon Jeſus Chriſt; they walk religiouſly in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlaſting felicity. As the godly conſi-

deration of predeſtination and our election in Chriſt is full of ſweet, pleaſant, and unſpeakable comfort to godly perſons, and ſuch as feel in themſelves the working of the ſpirit of Chriſt, mortifying the works of the fleſh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things; as well becauſe it doth greatly eſtabliſh and confirm their faith of eternal ſalvation, to be enjoyed through Chriſt, as becauſe it does fervently kindle their love towards God; ſo, for curious and carnal perſons, lacking the ſpirit of Chriſt, to have continually before their eyes the ſentence of God's predeſtination, is a moſt dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thruſt them either into deſperation, or into wretchleſneſs of moſt unclean living, no leſs perilous than deſperation. Furthermore, we muſt receive God's promiſes in ſuch wiſe as they be generally ſet forth to us in Holy Scripture. And in our doings, that will of God, is to be followed, which we have expreſsly declared unto us in the word of God."

Firſt. Theſe two religious points have been objects of myſterious and unprofitable controverſy. The principal militants are divided into marcionites and manichees, remonſtrants,

remonſtrants, arminians, and univerſaliſts, into the diſciples of Origen and Auſtin, into pelagians and ſemipelagians, into ſublapſarians and ſupralapſarians, into janſeniſts and jeſuits at Rome, into lutherans and calviniſts in England. As to our proteſtant Engliſh diſſenters, who are diſtinguiſhed by the contending titles of lutherans and calviniſts, and are martialed under the banners of pelagians and ſemipelagians, or of ſub and ſupralapſarians, ſince in a manner ſomewhat conſanguineous to the words ſub and ſupralapſarians, one party may be ſaid to be ſliding above, and the other under water, which of the two is in the moſt eligible condition I ſhall not undertake to determine, and they have my free will to go on to cavil and diſpute, and to ſpend their breath, till, by the preventing grace of God, they ſhall be converted to an univerſal good will and charity towards all their fellow-creatures, and ſhall reſolve to ſubmit, in matters eccleſiaſtical and civil, to the determination of their legal chriſtian governors, in a ſpirit of humility, deferance, and of a laudable ſubjection.

Secondly. To a right underſtanding of this article it is neceſſary to diſtinguiſh the

proper objects of foreknowledge and predeſtination. That the Almighty has an abſolute foreknowledge of all contingencies and events is no ambiguous point with me, but, on the contrary, is rather certain and indiſputable. From hence it is evident, that all the good and bad actions of men and angels are objects of foreknowledge, but are not objects of predeſtination. To ſay that the Almighty did predeſtinate, or præordain within himſelf, that any particular man ſhould live wickedly and rebelliouſly againſt the laws of his own ſupreme government, is blaſphemy. To ſay again that the ſpirit of God co-operates with the ſpirits of wicked men in doing wicked actions, and for their perſeverance in a vicious courſe of living, is alſo nonſenſe and blaſphemy. In ſhort, ſuch actions only in which the Almighty is ſuppoſed to be immediately concerned, or to be the author of, are proper objects of predeſtination. For inſtance, from a clear foreknowledge of the daily impieties, wickedneſſes, and rebellions, which the ſons of men would be guilty of, the Almighty did predeſtinate, even before a creation of the world, as a puniſhment for their ſins, that all corporeal objects, with which they are ſurrounded, ſhould be endowed with certain

tain powers to produce all the different kinds of natural evils, ſuch as agues, fevers, the gout, the ſtone, broken limbs, plagues, famines, peſtilences, earthquakes, and the like; and this we are clearly informed in the Holy Scriptures was done with a gracious deſign to bring ſinful creatures to repentance, to promiſes of a better obedience for the future, and to the moſt ſincere prayers, that ſome future trial ſhould be made of their fidelity and allegiance. From a clear foreknowledge again of the almoſt univerſal corruptions of idolatry, the Almighty did predeſtinate, even before the foundations of the world were laid, that, in the reign of Auguſtus Cæſar, a perſon ſhould be miraculouſly conceived and born into the world, in the adorable and moſt exalted character of Jeſus, the Son of God, the Chriſt, or the Meſſiah; that by a preaching of the new and divine religion of the Goſpel the corruptions of idolatry ſhould be gradually removed, by bringing the ſons of men back to the original religion of our firſt parents in paradiſe, or by introducing into their minds a belief, acknowlegment and adoration of himſelf, as the one only living and true God of heaven, and that his rational creatures, in conſequence of acting up to the

the laws and precepts of this new religion of the Goſpel, ſhould receive, through the merits of Chriſt, the moſt comfortable promiſes and aſſurances of a final juſtification and ſalvation. Now theſe things, in which the Almighty did reſolve to be immediately concerned, are proper objects of predeſtination: But the moral ſtate of rational creatures, or the morally good and bad actions which always have and will be done by them, are objects indeed of foreknowledge, but not of predeſtination. Nor can it be ſaid, without the higheſt blaſphemy, that Almighty God predeſtinated before all ages, that one part of his creatures ſhould be damned and the other ſaved, becauſe it muſt be directly repugnant to that univerſal love, good-will, and parental affection, which he muſt be ſuppoſed to have for all his rational creatures, as the original parent and ſupreme governor of them all, without diſtinction.

Thirdly. It has been already obſerved, and it is neceſſary to do ſo again, that the particular doctrines of a preventing and co-operating grace of free-will, of juſtification, predeſtination, and election, are doctrines delivered in the writings of the New Teſtament by Chriſt himſelf, and by his

his Apoſtles, who wrote and preached under ſome immediate inſtructions of inſpiration from God: I conclude therefore, and I hope juſtly, that they muſt be delivered there in a ſenſe which is perfectly conſiſtent with our notions of the infinite goodneſs and juſtice of God. In this ſenſe I underſtand them, in this I have ſubſcribed. And I further add, that the literal and grammatical conſtruction of words, in which they are expreſſed in the articles, will fairly admit of this ſenſe, or of a plain interpretation anſwerable to it; ſo that whoever is not ludicrouſly diſpoſed to cavil, and inſolently to contradict, may read theſe articles to the important purpoſe of godly edification. And from hence I ſhall briefly proceed to conſider theſe particular doctrines of predeſtination and election, as they are delivered by Saint Paul in the 8th chapter of his Epiſtle to the Romans. *Whom*, ſays the Apoſtle, *he did foreknow he alſo did predeſtinate to be conformed to the image of his Son*; and in the next verſe, *Whom he did predeſtinate, them he alſo called; and whom he called, them he alſo juſtified; and whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified.*

Firſt. It is evident, that ſome knowledge

ledge or foreknowledge of any thing to be done, muſt precede any deſtination or intention of doing it; and therefore the Apoſtle has placed the words *foreknow* and *predeſtinate* in this particular and philoſophical order of progreſſion: *For whom he did foreknow he alſo did predeſtinate.* From a foreknowledge that ſuch perſons as the Apoſtles would be living at the time when Chriſt would enter upon his Goſpel miniſtry, it was divinely predeſtinated that they ſhould be called to attend the perſon of Chriſt, and execute his inſtructions, as inſtruments of promoting and forwarding our redemption from the corruptions of idolatry, and from the death or puniſhments of ſin. And in the ſubſequent verſe the Apoſtle declares, *That whom he called, them he alſo juſtified; and whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified.* From hence we are plainly informed, that it was divinely predeſtinated to lay open to the underſtanding and judgment of the Apoſtles ſufficient and ſatisfactory evidences of Jeſus being the true Meſſiah; and, in conſequence of ſuch a conviction, they reſolved to obey the call, in attending upon his perſon, to execute his inſtructions, and to rely entirely upon his providence for a daily ſupport and protection, and to conform themſelves to the

the image of this Son of God, or to imitate his divine example of purity and virtue; and in conſequence of their perſevering in the duties of a good chriſtian, to them alſo it was predeſtinated to give the comfortable aſſurances and promiſes of being juſtified, or of obtaining a remiſſion of ſins (for to be juſtified and to obtain a remiſſion of ſins are phraſes of the ſame import): And, in the laſt place, *whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified.* Now to be glorified, in conſequence of being juſtified, or of having obtained a remiſſion of ſins, naturally implieth the receiving certain teſtimonies of divine love and favour, of honour, dignity, and glory, with an inconceiveable variety of bleſſings, which in Holy Scripture are promiſed to be conferred on thoſe who are called the ſpirits of juſt men made perfect. Seeing then what is to be underſtood in this part of the Holy Scriptures by a divine foreknowledge and predeſtination of things which were to be begun and to have an accompliſhment in ſome diſtant periods of futurity: Previous to a right underſtanding of this article of predeſtination or election, it is neceſſary to diſtinguiſh between the objects of predeſtination in God and Man; for predeſtination is an eſſential power or property of every rational or

free agent, whether created or uncreated; nor can any actions be proper objects of predeſtination but theſe of which any rational ſhall be the immediate doer; for which reaſon the following actions were proper objects of predeſtination in the Almighty: A creation of the ſun, moon, and ſtars, a creation of the world on which we live, of our original anceſtors in paradiſe, to give certain powers to all corporeal objects with which we are ſurrounded for producing the infinite variety of natural evils, as puniſhments due to ſinful creatures and rebellious ſubjects of government, to give to the earth certain powers of producing the neceſſaries of our ſubſiſtence, and, in a religious view of things, to ſend his ſon into the world, to call a particular number of jews to attend his perſon, and to be inſtruments of propagating his revealed religion, to juſtify and to glorify all chriſtians in a future ſtate of exiſtence, in conſequence of their having conformed themſelves to the image of his ſon, or in conſequence of having regularly practiſed the great duties of this his revealed religion. From hence I ſhall proceed to give the following paraphraſtical interpretation of this article, which its literal and grammatical ſenſe will fairly admit of.

A predeſtination to life is the everlaſting purpoſe of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath conſtantly decreed by his counſel ſecret to us, to deliver from curſe and damnation thoſe whom he hath choſen in Chriſt out of mankind, and to bring them by Chriſt to everlaſting ſalvation, as veſſels made to honour; or a predeſtination to life implieth a predeſtination in God, before the foundations of the world, to ſend his ſon into the world, and to grant to all good chriſtians, by a faith in Chriſt, in the merits of Chriſt, and by a regular practice of the great duties of his revealed religion, a deliverance from curſe and damnation, or from the curſe and damnation due to the ſins of an imperfect obedience; and of conſequence to give to good chriſtians, by virtue of the merits of Chriſt, of a faith in him, and by a good practice, an eternal life of happineſs. Wherefore, they that be endued with ſo excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpoſe by his ſpirit working in due ſeaſon; they through grace obey the calling, they be juſtified freely, they be made ſons of God by adoption, they be made like the image of his only begotten ſon Jeſus Chriſt, they walk religiouſly in good works, and

at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlaſting felicity. This propoſition alſo is made up of Scripture phraſes, expreſſing the happy effects and conſequences which are the natural reſult of the right faith and godly practice of chriſtians in any country, and in every ſucceeding age of the world. In the following part of this article it is ſaid, *as the godly conſideration of predeſtination and our election in Chriſt*; for all chriſtians, in Scripture language, are ſaidto be elected in Chriſt, as diſtinguiſhed from other men who profeſs the different and contrary religions of judaiſm or idolatry; and therefore this doctrine is here ſaid to be full of ſweet, pleaſant, and unſpeakable comfort to all ſuch godly perſons or chriſtians as feel in themſelves the working of the ſpirit of Chriſt; or all good chriſtians who are animated by a right faith in Chriſt muſt be ſenſible of its inclining and commanding them to mortify the works of the fleſh and of their earthly members, and to draw up their minds to high and heavenly things, and doth eſtabliſh and confirm their faith or hopes of eternal ſalvation, to be enjoyed through Chriſt, or through the merits of Chriſt, and does fervently kindle their love towards God; and now follows the character of bad chriſtians, and the miſeries

miſeries which belong to, or naturally flow from it: So for curious and carnal perſons, or as to carnally minded and carnally living chriſtians lacking the ſpirit of Chriſt, or who are not animated by a right faith in Chriſt, and have continually before their eyes the ſentence of God's predeſtination, or God's predeſtination not to give them the bleſſings of eternal life, is a moſt dangerous downfall, or muſt throw them into a moſt miſerable condition, in which the Devil doth thruſt them either into deſperation, or by which they fall into a ſtate of deſpair, or into wretchleſneſs of moſt unclean living, no leſs perilous of deſperation, or into reſolutions of perſevering in a ſtate of unclean or ungodly living, which muſt be attended with greater miſeries than a ſtate of perpetually deſpairing of God's mercy and reconciliation. And the article is thus concluded: *Furthermore, we muſt receive God's promiſes in ſuch wiſe as they be generally ſet forth to us in Holy Scripture; and in our doings, or in the common courſe of our lives, that will of God is to be followed which we have expreſsly declared unto us in the word of God.*

When it is ſaid in this article, that wicked chriſtians, when ſuppoſed to be recovered

covered into a ſtate of ſerious thinking, deſpair of God's mercy, from a perſuaſion that God had predeſtinated them for objects of an everlaſting diſpleaſure, it muſt not be ſuppoſed that the compilers of this article, or that Biſhop Jewel in particular, intended to juſtify the rectitude of ſuch a perſuaſion, but on the contrary to condemn it; becauſe it is repugnant to the general tenor of Holy Scripture; for God's mercy, or reconciliation through the merits of Chriſt, is every where promiſed to ſinners of every denomination upon their ſincere repentance.

This article conſiſts of ſcriptural words, terms, and phraſes, which may and ought to be interpreted by our ſettled notions of God's moral attributes of goodneſs and juſtice. In a manner conſonant to theſe divine attributes, they are delivered in the Holy Scriptures; and we are directed in the latter part of this article to interpret the doctrine of predeſtination in that particular ſenſe in which it is there delivered.

Secondly. Having ſhewn that ſuch actions only as are done by the infinite power of God can be objects of his predeſtination, it is neceſſary to enquire if all human actions

tions are not proper objects of predeſtination in ourſelves; and this will be proved from the following philoſophical poſition: That to look out for more than one ſufficient cauſe to account for any particular event or phænomenon, is unneceſſary and abſurd. To eat then, to drink, to viſit a friend, to ſend relief to a family in diſtreſs, to make prayers of private and public devotion, or, in a bad character, to murder and rob upon the highway, are actions ſurely, which do as naturally flow from ſome previous act of deſtination in men, as did a creation of the ſun, moon, and ſtars, from a predeſtination in the Almighty. To ſay, that human actions are the reſult of ſome joint predeſtination in God and Man, amounts to nothing more than what I call an huge falſhood or a monſtrous blaſphemy. That all human actions are objects of divine foreknowledge is readily granted, but it does not follow from hence that therefore they are objects of a divine predeſtination. It has been aſſerted indeed, by Mr. Soame Jenyns, that the Almighty's foreſeeing and permitting men and angels to make themſelves miſerable is the ſame thing as to predeſtinate and to be the immediate cauſe of their miſery. But ſurely God's permitting a man to rob and to murder,

murder, is equally different aud contrary from his being the cauſe and author of ſuch actions, as bitter and ſweet, in matters of taſte, or light and darkneſs, in thoſe of viſion. And that men are the predeſtinators and doers of their own actions is confirmed alſo by a verdict given from an appeal to the common ſenſe and reaſon of mankind, by a conſciouſneſs of their own exiſtence, and of the ſeveral active powers and faculties of humanity. Nor have the moſt unhappy and hardened ſinners, whoſe atrocious crimes have brought them to a gallows or a wheel, ever declared that they were neceſſitated to act wickedly by the influence of any malevolent demons.

Thirdly. It has been wantonly and unmeaningly aſſerted by Mr. Whiſton and the Confeſſional, that this article is calviniſtical, though with greater propriety it may be ſaid to be jewelian; and I am ſure that Biſhop Jewel never intended to borrow any religious currency from that conventicle doctor. But notwithſtanding theſe undeniable evidences of human free-agency, hiſtory informs us, that Luther was of opinion, that the mind was not free, but entirely enſlaved, and that he refuſed to hold any communion with the calviniſts,

becauſe

becauſe they more wiſely refuſed to determine the controverſy on this point between the ſub and ſupralapſarians; ſo that our calviniſtical diſſidents may be ſaid to opinate in a kind of amphibious condition, between ſlavery and freedom. But notwithſtanding the different opinions of our proteſtant diſſenters, which have been gradually degenerating from the pure ſtreams of our proteſting and reforming church into the diſturbed and foul waters of ſuperſtition and enthuſiaſm, if we attend to the proper objects of predeſtination, ſuch as the miraculous conception, or incarnation of Chriſt, to call, elect, and chooſe out of mankind, or out of jews and heathens, a certain number of perſons, who are called Apoſtles; to give them, by a preventing grace, ſatisfactory evidence of Jeſus being the true Meſſiah; to give both to them and to us, in conſequence of our chriſtian faith, the moſt comfortable aſſurances of being juſtified and glorified through the merits of Chriſt; if we attend, I ſay, to theſe proper objects of predeſtination, this doctrine muſt give, as it is particularly expreſſed in the article before us, unſpeakable comfort to godly perſons, or to all well-diſpoſed chriſtians; is eaſy to be underſtood, is moſt important in itſelf, and

highly deſerving to be ſubſcribed by every miniſterial divine.

ARTICLE 18. "Of obtaining eternal ſalvation only by the name of Chriſt: They alſo are to be had accurſed, that preſume to ſay, that every man ſhall be ſaved by the law or ſect which he profeſſeth, ſo that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature, for Holy Scripture doth ſet out unto us only the name of Jeſus Chriſt, whereby men muſt be ſaved."

The only two points in this article which deſerve any particular explanatory conſideration, are the phraſes, *to be had accurſed*, and *to ſet out only to us the name of Jeſus Chriſt, whereby men muſt be ſaved.*

Firſt. When it is ſaid, they are to be had accurſed that preſume to ſay, that every man ſhall be ſaved by the law or ſect which he profeſſeth, ſo that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature, we muſt here diſtinguiſh between erroneous opinions, or ſins of ignorance, and ſinful practices, or ſins knowingly and wilfully committed: The former, through the merits of Chriſt, are

are objects of divine pity and remiſſion; but the other, even through the merits of Chriſt, are not objects of pardon, without a ſincere repentance, and without embracing opportunities of amendment, when opportunities have been offered. And if we conſider, that not only ſinful practices, but even falſe doctrines, muſt to an infinitely wiſe and good Being be offenſive and diſpleaſing, it ſhould be no matter of ſurprize, that in ſcripture language, which is the language of God, they ſhould both be declared objects of a divine curſe, of wrath, diſpleaſure, and damnation. To be accurſed, is a ſcripture phraſe, and carries with it more or leſs degrees of ſeverity, according to the nature of the crime to which it is annexed.

Secondly. When it is ſaid, that *Holy Scripture doth only ſet out to us the name of Jeſus Chriſt, whereby we can be ſaved.* To ſay, that every one will be ſaved by a mere profeſſion of the name and religion of Chriſt, without any regard to the merits of his own ſacrifice, and of a life anſwerable to a chriſtian faith, contradicts the whole deſign and tenor of the goſpel religion; this, therefore, cannot be the true meaning of the article, but what the true

meaning of it is, will be evident from the two following propoſitions: That the beſt ſervices of the beſt of men can amount only to an imperfect obedience, that they muſt be eſteemed ſinful creatures, with ſins of omiſſion and commiſſion, from the juſt puniſhments of which, or from what is called in Scripture Language the death of ſin and the curſe of the law, they can have no right in themſelves, at a future tribunal, to be exempted. That Jeſus Chriſt, upon the conditions of a ſincere repentance, of an acknowledgment of their own ſinfulneſs, of promiſes of a better obedience, and of humble prayers for pardon and reconciliation, and through the merits of his own ſacrifice, hath promiſed a remiſſion of ſins to all good men, of all religions and countries; ſo that millions and millions of rational creatures, in a future ſtate, will be obliged to own themſelves indebted, for the unexpected and undeſerved benefits of an univerſal redemption, to the merits of Chriſt, of whoſe name, religion, and perſon, they might be utterly ignorant. And theſe conditions of ſalvation, through the merits of Chriſt, may be extended to every individual ſinner; for which reaſon, with all juſtneſs and propriety, it is declared by the church, in our communion

communion ſervice, that Jeſus Chriſt by his own ſacrifice hath made a full, perfect, and ſufficient ſacrifice, oblation, and ſatisfaction, for the ſins of the whole world.

Thirdly. If we compare this part of the 16th article, *That they are to be condemned which ſay, they can no more ſin, after baptiſm, as long as they live here,* with what is delivered in the beginning of this 18th Article, *They alſo are to be had accurſed that preſume to ſay, that every man ſhall be ſaved by the law or ſect which he profeſſeth,* it is highly probable, that, in a compariſon of theſe two paſſages, the compilers of theſe articles did allude to the ſtrange and abſurd doctrine of the particular religious ſect of puritans, for the ſame motto and definition is applicable both to ancient and modern puritans, *I thank God that I am not as other men are,* and indeed the words *puritan* and *puritaniſm* ſeem intended to expreſs a degree of ſelf-ſufficiency, not to be experienced within the ordinary bounds of humanity, and appear calculated to ſet forth a pretenſion to all the diſpenſations of divine love and favour, without any regard to the ineſtimable bleſſings and benefits of our truly chriſtian and ſcriptural redemption. And from hence even a literal

ral ſenſe of this article will admit of the following interpretation.

They alſo are to be had accurſed, or they alſo are to be had accurſed, as offending againſt the revealed will of God, that preſume to ſay, that every one ſhall be ſaved by the law or ſect which he profeſſeth, ſo that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature, or that preſume to ſay, that every one ſhall be ſaved by a perfect obedience to the doctrines, rules, and ordinances of that particular and chriſtian ſect which he profeſſeth, without any regard to the merits of Chriſt, and of a good life anſwerable to a chriſtian faith, for Holy Scripture doth ſet out unto us only the name of Jeſus Chriſt, whereby we can be ſaved, or the Holy Scripture doth inform us, that Chriſt alone hath revealed the conditions of ſalvation, whereby we, or the whole offspring of Adam, can be ſaved.

This article is what I call religiouſly inſtructive, is of the utmoſt conſequence in matters of religion, was intended to expreſs the true and ſcriptural doctrine of ſalvation, in oppoſition to the falſe and unſcriptural one, which had been maintained

tained by ſome particular erroneous and chriſtian ſectaries.

ARTICLE 19. "Of the Church: The viſible Church of Chriſt is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the ſacraments be duly adminiſtered according to Chriſt's ordinance, in all thoſe things that of neceſſity are requiſite to the ſame. As the Church of Hieruſalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, ſo alſo the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but alſo in matters of faith."

This article conſiſts of two propoſitions, the firſt is what I call religiouſly inſtructive, and the other is what I call hiſtorically true, being founded on ſome undoubted hiſtorical matters of fact, which highly deſerve the attention, and a place in the memorial treaſure houſe of every miniſter of our eſtabliſhed church; and the particular errors of the churches here mentioned, are clearly to be ſeen in the ſeveral articles, in which are expoſed and condemned the groſs unſcriptural doctrines and practices of the Romiſh Church. And I ſhall here repeat this article, with only one explanatory obſervation.

The

The viſible Church of Chriſt is a congregation of faithful men, or of men who have been baptized, educated in, and do ſincerely profeſs the fundamental doctrines and principles of a chriſtian faith, in the which church the pure word of God is preached, and the ſacraments be duly adminiſtered according to Chriſt's ordinance, in all things that of neceſſity are requiſite to the ſame. As the Church of Hieruſalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, ſo alſo the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but alſo in matters of faith.

The firſt propoſition expreſſeth the perfection of a chriſtian church, when chriſtians are aſſembled for the ſolemn buſineſs of public worſhip: That there is a perfectly chriſtian church, in any part of the chriſtian world, is no object of my ſubſcription; I have only ſubſcribed to what a perfectly chriſtian church is and ought to be, and this I have done in all readineſs of mind, truth, and ſincerity.

ARTICLE 20. "Of the authority of the Church: The church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority, in controverſies of faith; and yet it is not lawful

lawful to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it ſo expound one place of ſcripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the church be a witneſs and keeper of holy writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing againſt the ſame, ſo, beſides the ſame, ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for neceſſity of ſalvation."

Firſt. That the church, I mean the Church of England, or the clerical and lay divines of an Engliſh convocation and parliament, have a power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority, in controverſies of faith, is a point ſtrongly corroborated by the judgment of the great Biſhop Jewel in the following part of his Apology :---

De multitudine otioſarum ceremoniarum ſcimus Auguſtinum graviter ſuo tempore conqueſtum eſſe. Itaque nos magnum earum numerum reſecavimus, quod illis ſciremus affligi conſcientias hominum et gravari Eccleſiam Dei. Retinemus tamen et colimus non tantum ea, quæ ſcimus tradita fuiſſe ab Apoſtolis, ſed etiam alia quædam, quæ nobis videbantur ſine Eccleſiæ incommodo ferri poſſe ; quod omnia cuperemus in ſacro cætu, ut

Paulus jubet, decenter atque ordine adminiſtrari. Ea vero omnia quæ aut valde ſuperſtitioſa, aut frigida, aut ſpurea aut ridiculæ, aut cum ſacris literis pugnantia, aut etiam ſobriis hominibus indigna eſſe videbamus, qualia infinita ſunt hodie in papatu, prorſus ſine ulla exceptione repudiavimus; quad nollemus Dei cultum ejuſmodi ineptiis longius contaminari.

Secondly. The firſt clauſe of this article is called the controverted clauſe, for the two following reaſons: *Firſt,* It being an object of controverſy between the lutheran and calviniſtial religioniſts, and the truly proteſtant and reforming divines of the Church of England;— and *ſecondly,* Becauſe it is made a matter of ambiguity. If this firſt clauſe was a part of the original articles, ſigned and ratified in the year 1562, by the clerical and lay divines of convocation and parliament, though to me it does not appear to be of ſo much conſequence in matters of religion as it has been commonly repreſented, for whether it was, or was not, in the original articles, is a point in which I do not think myſelf materially intereſted: The principal point with me, as a ſubſcriber, is, If the doctrine of this clauſe has a clear warrant from reaſon, a

conſonancy

conſonancy to, or at leaſt no repugnancy to any plain document of the goſpel revelation, becauſe if I can anſwer this to myſelf in the affirmative, my judgment is convinced, and my conſcience at eaſe.

Thirdly. If the firſt clauſe of this article was, or was not a part of the original articles, has been a matter of fierce diſpute, of an hiſtorical and learned controverſy; and the caſe ſtands briefly thus: The original regiſters of the convocation, in the year 1562, are not extant, having been deſtroyed in a dreadful fire at London; but various printed and manuſcript copies of them were preſerved in private ſtudies, in public libraries, in cathedrals, and in other places of record. And theſe, like copies of other books, have different dates, various readings and miſtakes, which frequently fall from the preſs and the pen of tranſcribers, being all particularly exhibited by the learned and ingenious Dr. Bennet. By this learned divine the ſeveral copies in the libraries of St. John's and of Bennet Colleges in Cambridge, and in the Bodleyan Library of Oxford, with many others committed into his enquiring hands, by gentlemen of eminence and eccleſiaſtical dignity, have been carefully and ſtudiouſly

collated; and from the reſult of his inquiries it is highly reaſonable to conclude, that this controverted clauſe was a part of the original articles: So that whoever attentively reads Dr. Bennet's full and ſatisfactory account of this matter, will be inclined to look upon the Confeſſional's ſcrap quotations from Calamy and Selden as the crude production of a prejudiced and injudicious reader. Nor does he ſeem to have known any thing more of this controverſy than he had picked up from an infamous book, called *Prieſtcraft to perfection*, which was written by a friend of the famous deiſt, Anthony Collins, who never had honeſty enough to give a faithful narration, nor underſtanding to determine upon ſo delicate a point, which he did inſolently pretend to ſettle, by a mere arbitrary uſe of the words Oxford and Bodleyan Library. And I am here tempted to obſerve, with the utmoſt ſincerity, that the author of the Confeſſional is one of theſe writers, who reads every thing, or every book, without taking time to enter into the real deſign or meaning of any. And from hence I ſhall proceed to interpret and to underſtand this article, according to a literal or grammatical conſtruction of words in which it is expreſſed.

The

The Church, or the Church of England, or the clerical or lay divines of her convocation and parliament, hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority, in controverſies of faith, and yet it is not lawful to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it ſo expound one place of ſcripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the church is a witneſs and keeper of holy writ, or whereas the church is particularly intereſted to preſerve true and genuine copies of the Old and New Teſtament, yet as it ought not to decree any thing againſt the ſame, ſo, beſides the ſame, ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for neceſſity of ſalvation.

Firſt. It muſt be highly abſurd not to ſuppoſe, that the word Church here ſignifieth the Church of England, in oppoſition to that of Rome, or to the Lutheran and Calviniſtical Church of Conventicles.

Secondly. When it is ſaid, that the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, it muſt of neceſſity mean one or more perſons inveſted with a legiſlative power to ſettle articles of faith, and to eſtabliſh every thing relative to public worſhip.

In

In the year 1562 the power of the church to do this was the power of the clerical and lay divines of convocation and parliament; but, in the preſent age of a convocation nullity, the power of the church is the power only of the clerical and lay divines of parliament.

Thirdly. If we conſider the difference between a clerical and lay divine, that the word *divine* is applicable both to males and females; that every one when grown to years of maturity and judgment muſt be a divine to himſelf, being now become accountable for what is done, both to God and ſociety; that every rational creature muſt act in the different characters of a divine and a politician; that the members of parliament, in things relative to religion or to the church, muſt act in the capacity of churchmen or divines, but in things relative to the ſtate that they act in the characters of ſtateſmen and politicians: Theſe things being duly attended to, the word *church* has a meaning conſpicuous and ſettled. And whatever the Confeſſional, in his haltered ſtring of puritans, of arminians and calviniſts, of univerſaliſts and remonſtrants, of ſub and ſupralapſarians, with an innumerable tribe of dark and myſterious

myſterious epithets of non-conformiſts, ſhall affirm to the contrary, we juſtly claim the liberty of declaring, that ſince the gift of miracles ceaſed with the Apoſtles, and the gift of inſpiration with their ſucceſſors, when the chriſtian religion was ſanctioned and ſupported by the authority of legiſlative eſtabliſhments; under ſuch circumſtances, I ſay, we juſtly claim the liberty of declaring, that no paſſages of Holy Scripture can be produced which clearly expreſs a repugnancy to the mind of Chriſt, or of God, that the legiſlative divines of every diſtinct chriſtian country ſhould exerciſe a power of eſtabliſhing articles of faith, and ſome certain modes of public worſhip, which they ſhall think moſt perfect and acceptable to God, for whoſe immediate honour and ſervice they are intended. This article is what I call religiouſly inſtructive and hiſtorically true, being confirmed by the judgment and practice of clerical and legiſlative divines, in chriſtian countries, ever ſince the firſt eſtabliſhment of chriſtianity. The two propoſitions which it contains are plain and important, and deſerve to make a part of every one's ſyſtem of divinity, in the ſeveral diſtinct offices and departments of our eſtabliſhed church.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE 21. "Of the authority of general councils: General councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes; and when they be gathered, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the spirit and will of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining to God. Wherefore, things ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture."

This article was evidently designed to enforce the three following doctrines: --- *First*, The right of christian kings, princes, emperors, or of the civil magistrate, to convoke general councils;---*Secondly*, The possibility and reality of their erring, or of declaring erroneous and unscriptural doctrines;--- *Thirdly*, That no article of faith which they shall establish can have weight or authority, unless it has a plain warrant from Holy Scripture. The right of christian kings, or of the christian civil magistrate, to convoke a general council, and as it is expressed in the preceding article, *To decree rites and ceremonies, and authority, in controversies of faith, or to establish and ratify*

ratify, by his legiſlative authority, certain forms of prayer, or modes of public worſhip, is particularly proved by the great Biſhop Jewel, in the character of an able hiſtorian and a moſt judicious divine.

Firſt. His lordſhip traceth this power back from its original under the law; in which Moſes is commanded by the Almighty himſelf to inſtitute Aaron into the prieſthood.

Theſe are indiſputable matter of facts, that Moſes was declared to be God's vicegerent, and that Aaron had no right to execute the offices of the prieſthood, till he had been ordained to theſe offices by the civil magiſtrate Moſes: Nor, concerning the fitneſs of ſuch a particular progreſſion or order of things, do I preſume to determine, this being the peculiar and immediate prerogative of divine wiſdom, or of a divine deſignation. The power of Moſes and Joſhua, in matters of religion, are thus deſcribed :--- *Moſes, civilis magiſtratus, et ductor populi, omnem religionis et ſacrorum rationem et accepit a Deo, et populo tradidit. Joſue, et ſi non aliud erat quam magiſtratus civilis, tamen cum primum inauguretur et præficeretur populo, accepit mandata nominatim de religione, deque colendo Deo.*

After this he proceeds in the following manner to delineate the rights and practice of the jewiſh princes David and Solomon, in matters of eccleſiaſtical concern and government.

David Rex cum omnis jam religio ab impio Saule prorſus eſſet diſſipata reduxit arcam Dei, hoc eſt, religionem reſtituit: Nec tantum adfuit ut admonitor et hortator operis, ſed etiam pſalmos et hymnos dedit, et claſſes diſpoſuit, et pompam inſtituit, et quodammodo præfuit ſacerdotibus. Solomon Rex ædificavit templum Domino, quod ejus pater David animo tantum deſtinavit: Et poſtremo orationem egregiam habuit ad populum de religione et cultu Dei: Et Abiatharum Epiſcopum poſtea ſummovit, et in ejus locum Sadocum ſurrogavit.

Having deſcribed the authority and practice of the jewiſh princes in eccleſiaſtical affairs, he proceeds to give the following account of ſimilar powers, which were claimed and exerciſed by chriſtian emperors with the moſt ready conſent and approbation of the moſt eminent and learned divines: ---- *Olim Imperatores Chriſtiani indicebant Epiſcoporum Concilia: Conſtantinus Nicenum, Theodoſius Primus, Conſtantinopolitanum;*

tinopolitanum; Theodosius Secundus Ephesinum: Martianus Chalcedonense. Omnino per annos quingentos Imperator solus agebat conventus sacros, et Episcoporum concilia celebrabat. And in the following paragraph we have a summary and judicious account, in matters of divinity, of the authority and conduct of the civil magistrate, both under the law and the gospel: *Jam vero qui auctoritatem sumunt in Episcopo; qui a Deo accipiunt mandata de religione; qui reducunt arcam Dei, componunt sacros psalmos, præsunt sacerdotibus, ædificant templa, habent conciones de cultu Dei; qui templa repurgant, demoliuntur excelsa, incendunt lucos; qui sacerdotes admonent officii, et illis scribunt leges vitæ; qui prophetas impios occidunt; qui Episcopos summovent; qui cogunt concilia Episcoporum; qui cum Episcopis una sedent, eosque quid agendum sit instituunt; qui episcopum hæreticum supplicio adjudicant, qui de religione cognoscunt, qui subscribunt, qui pronuntiant, atque hæc omnia non alieno jussu, sed nomine suo, et rectè et piè faciunt, an ad eos dicemus religionis curam non pertinere? Aut magistratum christianum qui hisce rebus sese admisceat, aut improbe, aut immodestè aut impiè facere? Hisce rebus imperatores et reges antiquissimi et christianissimi sese admiscuerant.* In this part of ecclesiastical

hiſtory, which his lordſhip has here faithfully produced, we are informed, that the firſt chriſtian emperors did ſit in a council of learned and eminent divines, ſubſcribed with them the moſt important articles of faith, and gave to every thing relative to public worſhip the ſanctions of a legiſlative authority.

Secondly. It can be no matter of ſurprize, that Chriſt ſhould declare that his kingdom was not of this, or confined to this world, becauſe in his divine perſon he was the king of heaven, lord and governor of the whole univerſe. And from hence we may naturally draw the following conſequences:

Firſt. That chriſtian emperors, kings, princes, or civil magiſtrates, by whatever titles they ſhall be diſtinguiſhed, muſt be equal vicegerents of Chriſt or of God, in the ſame manner as it had been divinely declared to Moſes.

Secondly. It muſt be agreeable to the will of God, that the power of the civil magiſtrate, in matters of religion, ſhould be the ſame under the goſpel diſpenſation, as it had been pronounced under that of the law.

Thirdly.

Thirdly. That the power of ordaining a prieſthood, as given by Chriſt himſelf to his Apoſtles and to their ſucceſſors, muſt naturally be abſorbed in, ſuperſeded and diſannulled by, the legiſlative authority of his own repreſentative, in the exalted character of a civil magiſtrate, upon his converſion to chriſtianity.

Fourthly. That the law was and ought to have been a rule of power and religious conduct to the firſt chriſtian emperor in the appointment of biſhops to ſuperintend and direct the affairs of eccleſiaſtical government, and to eſtabliſh, by the exerciſe of his legiſlative authority, whatever ſhould be judged requiſite to the important buſineſs of public worſhip. Under the law Moſes received a divine commiſſion for initiating Aaron into the prieſthood, to build a tabernacle, to adorn it as it became the houſe of God, to unite with the prieſthood in all things of religious concernment, and to provide for thoſe, whoſe time and ſervices were devoted to holy things, by a tenth of temporalities. Things of this nature muſt, like the ten commandments, be of perpetual obligation, being founded on theiſm itſelf, and on our ideas of univerſal equity and juſtice. And indeed

deed the learned Biſhop Jewel has faithfully and hiſtorically proved the religious practice of the firſt Emperor Conſtantine, under the goſpel, to have a perfect agreement with what had been divinely inſtituted under the law.

Having thus conſidered what was neceſſary to prove the authority of chriſtian princes to call general councils, let us hear what this great man has ſaid concerning the ſecond propoſition of this article,--- *Foraſmuch as they be an aſſembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the ſpirit and will of God, they may err, and ſometime have erred even in things pertaining to God.*

Firſt. Concerning erroneous doctrines which have been warranted by ſome general councils of the Romiſh Church, as they relate to what is expreſſed in the 19th article, called their living and manner of ceremonies, and ſome particular matters of faith, his lordſhip has made the following judicious remark, after having expoſed the corruptions of this adulterated church : — *Tamen id ſatis eſt nobis ſatiſque debet eſſe homini prudenti et pio, et de æterna vitâ cogitanti nos ab ea Eccleſiâ diſceſſiſſe, quæ errare potuerit, quam Chriſtus qui errare non poteſt*

poteſt, tanto ante prædixerit erraturam, quamque nos ipſi occulis perſpicue videbamus a ſanctis patribus, ab Apoſtolis, a Chriſto ipſo, primitiva et Catholica Eccleſia diſceſſiſſe. Though undoubtedly our learned compiler alludes particularly to thoſe few general councils, in which the hæretical and erroneous arian doctrine had been depoſited, and at which councils Athanaſius and Chryſoſtom did refuſe to be preſent, though called upon by imperatorial authority for that purpoſe. Of this intereſting matter of fact he hath given us the following account: ---- *Athanaſius cum veniſſet ad Concilium Syrmianum, et ex hoſtium ſuorum ferocia, atque odio, animo rei eventum præſagiret, ſtatim ſarcinas collegit atque abiit. Johannes Chryſoſtomus, quamvis quaternis literis ab imperatore Arcadio vocatus eſſet ad Concilium Arrianorum, tamen domi ſe continuit.* It is ſomething very remarkable that his lordſhip never applies the word *catholic*, or the latin word *catholicus*, to any church, prince, or biſhop, but to ſuch as did maintain and believe the doctrine of the trinity, or the divinity of Chriſt and of the Holy Ghoſt. And though the word *catholic*, as derived from the greek, ſignifieth univerſal, yet he every where uſeth it in oppoſition to that of Arrian. So that the doc-

trine

trine of the trinity is juſtly made by this great divine the leading, principal, or characteriſtical doctrine of a true chriſtian church, or of a right chriſtian faith. And I would here obſerve, though I do not pretend to boundary the mercies of Chriſt, or of God, that the conditions of our chriſtian ſalvation, or the merits of Chriſt by the particular great ſacrifice of his humanity, are founded on his divinity; and that no one hath juſt reaſon to expect to be a partaker of the benefits of this chriſtian ſacrifice by whom his divinity is denied. And here alſo I will take occaſion to explain theſe two paſſages of our Athanaſian Creed, which have been ſo unjuſtly repreſented by injudicious divines as objects of uncharitable and perſecuting horror ---When it is ſaid, *Whoever will be ſaved, it is neceſſary that he hold the catholic faith*, we ought to underſtand, that no one can reaſonably and juſtly expect to ſhare the benefits of that redemption, which Chriſt has purchaſed for all mankind by the one oblation of himſelf on the croſs, unleſs he believes that doctrine which is the characteriſtical doctrine of the catholic faith; nor is there any church in the whole extent of chriſtendom, if we juſtly divide it into the churches of Rome, England, and into

thoſe which were planted by Luther and Calvin, in which the doctrine of the trinity is not made the foundation of a true chriſtian faith: And when it is ſaid, *This is the catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be ſaved*, it may be underſtood, that the comfortable aſſurances of a chriſtian ſalvation, in the exerciſe of our clerical function, can be extended to no one who diſbelieveth this article of our chriſtian divinity. We allow, indeed, that the divinity of Chriſt has been denied by a few of exaggerated eminence in the literary world, ſuch as Whiſton, by the author of the Puritanic Confeſſional, by the author of the Memoirs of the Ladies of Great-Britain*, by Lindſey and Jebb; but I have

* This author may be ſaid to be one of the beſt ſcholars and writers of his age; and with regard to men, things, and books, to be one of the moſt knowing divines, though a moſt erroneous and unfortunate one, as is evident from his ill judged and adopted characters of a Bull and a Bullock, and from his epicurean adventures with a Curl and his Bagnio. And I am inclined to think, that if any ſenſible and judicious divine would reſolve to give him a thorough purgation from theſe exceptionable and offenſive narrations, from its unſavory vapours of arrian infidelity, and from his impertinent ſtories of his ſeven matrimonial confederacies, his book might be rendered extremely valuable in the particular province of divinity, there being ſcarce any eminent book or divine in Engliſh or foreign literature of which he has not given us ſome inſtructive account, and the moſt intereſting circumſtances of biography.

no authority to ſay, that the petitioning clergy, who in a ſtrange unaccountable eccentricity of judgment did reſolve to halter themſelves in alliance with enthuſiaſtic and factious diſſidents, do reject a doctrine which they were ſuppoſed to ſubſcribe in the full ſunſhine-lights of ſcriptural evidence and conviction. So that becauſe an inconſiderable number, under pretenſions of a free inquiry, cannot prevail upon multitudes of judicious and eminent divines to ſacrifice the major to the minor part of an argument, and to renounce a doctrine which is the eſtabliſhed faith of every chriſtian church in the whole extent of chriſtendom, or puſillanimouſly to deſert the cauſe of religious liberty, therefore the Church of England has been lately repreſented to be in ſo ruinous and decaying a condition, that nothing can poſſibly reſtore her to the full ſtrength of reaſon and revelation but a ſpeedy reſolving to be directed by the erroneous judgment of hæretical architects and arrian reformiſts.

This article, then, in which it is ſaid, *That general councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes; and when they be gathered (foraſmuch as they be an aſſembly of men, whereof all*

all be not governed with the ſpirit and will of God) they may err, and ſometime have erred even in things pertaining to God; wherefore, things ordained by them, as neceſſary to ſalvation, have neither ſtrength nor authority unleſs it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture. This article is what I call hiſtorically true, and politically right, being founded on certain revealed rules of divine polity, and is religiouſly inſtructive, nor does it ſtand in need of any paraphraſtical interpretation, becauſe in its grammatical conſtruction of words it is conſpicuouſly intelligible; and I may add, that in doctrine it is both intereſting and important.

ARTICLE 22. "Of purgatory: The Romiſh doctrine, concerning purgatory, pardons, worſhipping and adoration, as well of images, as of reliques; and alſo, invocation of ſaints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of ſcripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God."

Concerning the Church of Rome, her purgatory, and her maſſes, Biſhop Jewel has thus pertinently and admirably written, who, as I have before obſerved, was obliged

to travel, in Queen Mary's reign, through the countries of popery, and had been an eye witneſs to the many abſurd and ſuperſtitious doctrines which he ſincerely expoſed and has accurately deſcribed : —

Nam quod de purgatorio iſti ſuo jactare ſolent, etſi illud ſcimus non ita novum eſſe, tamen non aliud quam fatuum et anile commentum eſt. Who can doubt but theſe words of the article, *is a fond thing vainly invented,* and the latin ones, *fatuum et anile commentum eſt,* were dictated by the ſame head, and fell from the ſame pen. And thus he proceeds, *Auguſtinus quidem modo hujuſmodi quendam locum eſſe ait, modo poſſe eſſe non negat modo dubitat, modo prorſus pernegat, et in eo homines humana quadam benevolentiâ putat falli. Tamen ab hoc errore uno, tanta crevit ſeges ſacrificulorum ; ut cum in omnibus angulis miſſæ palam et publice venderentur, templa Dei facta fuerint tabernæ meritoriæ, et miſeris mortalibus perſuaſum fuerit, nihil prorſus eſſe vendibilibus iſtis utilius.*— In another place, where he is holding out the high nonſenſe of ſuppoſing, that there can be any difference between the character of the Pope and that of Saint Peter, whilſt he was at Rome, we have the following obſervations : --- *Niſi hoc forte velint*

velint dicere Petrum cum eſſet Romæ nunquam docuiſſe Evangelium, nunquam paviſſe gregem, abſtuliſſe claves regni cælorum, abſcondiſſe theſauros Domini ſui. Tantum ſediſſe in laterano et omnia ſpatia purgatorii, et ſuppliciorum genera digito deſcripſiſſe; animas miſeras alias in cruciatum relegaſſe, alias accepta mercede repente pro arbitrio exemiſſe. There is no part of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory in which the gainful inventions and ſuperſtitious practices of the Roman Church are more copiouſly and particularly deſcribed. And whereas it became good proteſtants in the year 1562, when the reformation was in its infant ſtate, to expoſe the erroneous doctrines of the Roman Church, it was neceſſary alſo that the clerical members of a proteſtant church ſhould be reminded, by a ſubſcription, of a matter of fact ſo intereſting and important.

ARTICLE 23. "Of miniſtring in the congregation: It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or miniſtring the ſacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and ſent to execute the ſame. And theſe we ought to judge lawfully called and ſent, which be choſen and called to this work by men who have public authority

rity given unto them in the congregation, to call and ſend miniſters into the Lord's vineyard."

This article conſiſts of two propoſitions, which are equally intelligible as any two propoſitions in the beſt written book in the world. And the deſign of its compilation is evident by attending to what has been advanced on the 21ſt Article, concerning a power given by a divine deſignation to the civil magiſtrate Moſes for an inſtitution of the prieſthood, and concerning that particular order or progreſſion of things, relative to it, which was eſtabliſhed by Chriſt himſelf, and was continued in a regular ſucceeding line of divine authority to the Emperor Conſtantine, when it was naturally deſigned to terminate in chriſtian emperors, kings, and princes, or in every chriſtian civil magiſtrate, who muſt be the immediate repreſentative or vicegerent of Chriſt or of God under the goſpel diſpenſation, in the ſame manner as it had been declared to Moſes under that of the law. And from hence it is proved, and this article was intended to ſignify, that the religious character of ſilly or wiſe women and handicrafts amongſt anabaptiſts, antepaidobaptiſts, methodiſts, moravians, and even

of

of the whole tribe of Engliſh preſbyterians and puritanical independents, has no warrant from the Holy Scriptures both of the law and the goſpel.

In the year 1562, when the rights and prerogatives of civil magiſtracy centered in the feminine gender, they became amongſt diſputatious puritans a point of controverſy. And the Confeſſional himſelf obſerves, to make uſe of his own word, "that the powers of civil magiſtracy in the hands of a woman was an eye ſore both to puritans and papiſts; ſo that both were enemies to the queen's perſon and government upon one common principle:" Nor had the two well-qualified directors of the helms both of church and ſtate, I mean Whitgift and Cecil, leſs to fear from the intrigues of the one, than from the factious machinations of the other. But all controverſies of this nature, whether maſculine or feminine, being objects rather of ſhadows than ſubſtances, I induſtriouſly avoid. And I ſhall only add, that this article was evidently deſigned to expreſs the doctrine and practice of our eſtabliſhed church concerning the ſcriptural order of prieſthood, and of which, in the words of Biſhop Jewel's Apology, we have the following repreſentation:

repreſentation :---*Miniſtrum legitime vocari oportere, et recte atque ordine præſici Eccleſiæ Dei; neminem autem ad ſacrum miniſterium pro ſuo arbitrio et libidine poſſe ſe intrudere.*†

ARTICLE 24. "Of ſpeaking in the congregation in ſuch a tongue as the people underſtandeth: It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God and the cuſtom of the primitive church to have public prayer in the church, or to miniſter the ſacraments in a tongue not underſtanded of the people."

Firſt.

† The forbearing indeed and gentle ſpirit of our eſtabliſhed church tolerates people of different ſectaries to preach their falſe notions and prejudices of education; but this indulgence can, in reality, give their pretenſions no reaſonable or ſcriptural ſanction. Our Engliſh diſſidents juſtify their pretenſions, I think, by this undeniable matter of fact, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles had no legal authority from the civil magiſtrate to preach the Goſpel: Nor was it poſſible that it ſhould be ſo; becauſe it is moſt highly abſurd to ſuppoſe, that an idolatrous magiſtrate ſhould give a commiſſion to preach doctrines direct contrary to his religious eſtabliſhment. And if our proteſtant Engliſh diſſenters will allow that their religion is equally repugnant to this of our proteſtant and eſtabliſhed Church of England, as the nature of chriſtianity is to that of judaiſm or idolatry, they ſhall have my free leave to take full poſſeſſion of the point for which they contend: But ſince one God, one faith, one baptiſm, one Lord and Saviour of all, are the common and fundamental doctrines of both, Providence ſurely can be ſuppoſed to have no particular end to anſwer in a toleration of any other perſons to preach and to adminiſter the ſacraments but ſuch as ſhall be regularly appointed by our eſtabliſhed and epiſcopal prieſthood.

Firſt. Beyond all controverſy it muſt have been agreeable to the great deſigns of infinite wiſdom to give the Apoſtles the gift of tongues, that the new and ſaving truths of the goſpel religion might be communicated to the inhabitants of different countries in their reſpective language, which the Apoſtles, under the ordinary advantages of ſtudy and practice, were ſuppoſed not to underſtand; and not to preach the ſaving truths of the goſpel in a plain and intelligible manner, or to abuſe this gift of inſpiration (for all divine gifts in the hands of fallible and proud men may be perverted), is particularly condemned by Saint Paul in his epiſtolary writings of the New Teſtament.

Secondly. This article was undoubtedly intended to inform proteſtants at large, and our clerical divines in particular, of a groſſly unreaſonable and unſcriptural doctrine of popery. And in the following manner, in Biſhop Jewel's Apology, it is condemned in a very pertinent and judicious defence of our eſtabliſhed church: --- *Precamur ea linguâ quam noſtri, ut par eſt, omnes intelligunt, ut populus, quemadmodum Paulus monet, é communibus voris utilitatem communem capiat: Quemadmodum omnes patres pii, et*

Catholici Epiſcopi, non tantum in veteri verum etiam in novo teſtamento et precati ſunt ipſi, et populum precari docuerunt, ne, ut Auguſtinus ait, tanquam pſittaci et merulæ, videamur ſonare quod neſcimus. And in another place, where the practice and doctrine of the Romiſh Church is placed in oppoſition to that of ours, we have the following paragraph: *Nos ita precamur in templis, ut quemadmodum Paulus monet, populus ſcire poſſit quid precamur, et communibus votis reſpondere, Amen. Iſti ut æs tinniens voces in templis ignotas, et peregrinas, ſine intelligentiâ, ſine ſenſu, ſine mente fundunt, et omnino id agunt, ne populus quidquam poſſit intelligere.*

ARTICLE 25. "Of the ſacraments: Sacraments ordained of Chriſt be not only badges or tokens of chriſtian men's profeſſion, but rather they be certain ſure witneſſes and effectual ſigns of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work inviſibly in us, and doth not only quicken but alſo ſtrengthen and confirm our faith in him. There are two ſacraments ordained of Chriſt our Lord in the Goſpel, that is to ſay, baptiſm, and the ſupper of the Lord."

"Thoſe

"Thoſe five commonly called ſacraments, that is to ſay, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be counted for ſacraments of the goſpel, being ſuch as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apoſtles, partly are ſtates of life allowed by the ſcriptures, but yet have not like nature of ſacraments with baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper, for that they have not any viſible ſign or ceremony ordained of God.

"The ſacraments were not ordained of Chriſt to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we ſhould duly uſe them; and in ſuch only as worthily receive the ſame they have a wholeſome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily purchaſe to themſelves damnation, as Saint Paul ſaith."

Firſt. It is allowed by the whole lutheran and calviniſtical fraternity, or confederates againſt the eſtabliſhed Church of England, that only two ſacraments (I mean baptiſm, and the Lord's ſupper) were inſtituted and ordained by Chriſt himſelf. Seven ſacraments, indeed, are believed and maintained by the Romiſh Church. Nor on theſe five which are diſallowed by all

proteſtant diſſenters in common with ourſelves ſhall I make any particular obſervations, and eſpecially ſince the catholics alſo are divided in opinion, concerning their ſcriptural authority. Whoever is diſpoſed to be curious in things of this nature, let him conſult Dr. Burnet, who on this ſubject is both copious and learned. I ſhall here chiefly confine myſelf to producing ſuch paſſages from Biſhop Jewel's Apology as anſwer to the leading and principal parts of this article, which in its literal and grammatical conſtruction of words is plain and important. Anſwerable to what is ſaid, that ſacraments are badges or tokens of chriſtian men's profeſſion, we have this remarkable obſervation, ſanctioned by the opinion of the truly catholic and moſt eminent fathers: ----- *Eaque cum Tertulliano, Origine, Ambroſio, Auguſtino, Hieronymo, Chryſoſtomo, Baſilio, Dionyſio, aliiſque catholicis patribus, figuras, ſigna, ſymbola, typos, antitypa, formas, ſigilla, ſignacula, ſimilitudines, exemplaria, imagines, recordationes, memorias appellamus.* And that ſacraments be certain ſure witneſſes and effectual ſigns of grace, and God's will or good will towards us, by the which he doth work inviſibly in us, and doth not only quicken but alſo ſtrengthen and confirm

firm faith in him.—Thus we read in the Apology: *Recipimus ſacramenta Eccleſiæ, hoc eſt, ſacra quædam ſigna cæremonias, quibus Chriſtus nos uti voluit, nobis ante oculos conſtitueret, et fidem noſtram quam habemus in ſanguine ejus vehementius confirmaret et gratiam ſuam in cordibus noſtris obſignaret.*

In the latter part of this article in which it is ſaid, *That ſacraments were not ordained of Chriſt to be gazed upon, or to be carried about*, a moſt abſurd and ridiculous practice of the Romiſh Church, is plainly exhibited and condemned. And his lordſhip has expreſſed it in latin in a manner elegant, truly claſſical and nervous: --- *Nundinationes vero et auctiones miſſarum, et circumgeſtationes atque adorationes panis, et alias idololatricas et blaſphemas ineptias, quas nemo iſtorum affirmare poteſt Chriſtum et Apoſtolis tradidiſſe, in Eccleſiis noſtris non ferimus; et Epiſcopos Romanos recte reprehendimus, qui ſine verbo Dei, ſine auctoritate ſanctorum patrum, ſine exemplo, novo more, non tantum præponunt populo panem Euchariſticum divino cultu adorandum, ſed etiam illum in equo Gradario quocunque ipſi iter faciunt, ut olim ignem Perſicum, aut Iſidis ſacra circumferunt, et Chriſti ſacramenta ad ſcenam jam et pompam traduxerunt, ut in ea re*

re hominum oculi nihil aliud quam inſanis ſpectaculis et ludicra levitate paſcerentur.

When it is ſaid in the latter part of this article, *but they that receive them* (or the ſacraments) *unworthily, purchaſe to themſelves damnation, as Saint Paul ſaith,* I would here obſerve, that every ſcripture doctrine muſt be delivered in a ſenſe agreeable to reaſon and to the moral attributes of God, and that with regard to any particular article, and the ſeveral parts of it which are made up of ſcripture phraſes, his lordſhip never fails to remind us, that we muſt underſtand them in that ſenſe, and in that ſenſe only, in which their doctrines are delivered in the Holy Scriptures; and in the caſe before us his lordſhip directs us to interpret the word *damnation* in that ſenſe in which Saint Paul uſeth it when he is writing of the Corinthians' unworthy manner of receiving the ſacrament. Nor can I diſmiſs this article without endeavouring to exculpate the Church of England from the charge of believing the Romiſh doctrine of tranſubſtantiation; which charge is brought againſt us by the whole croud of preſbyterians and jove-like independents, from the manner in which the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper is repreſented in our moſt

moſt excellent catechiſm. Now theſe are the terrible words of a tranſubſtantiated ſacrament:

What is the outward part or ſign of the Lord's ſupper?

Bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.

What is the inward part or thing ſignified?

The body and blood of Chriſt, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's ſupper.

But if we attend to the ordinary method and proceſs of logical argumentation, and to the manner in which things relative to the ſacrament are repreſented by our judicious divine and learned apologiſt, the jarring ſounds of calviniſtical trumpeters of tranſubſtantiation will be eaſily and effectually ſilenced.

Firſt. It muſt be taken for granted, that when two viſible or preſent and corporeal objects are made to repreſent two other corporeal ones which are removed from ſight, and of conſequence inviſible, the

the repreſenting objects are diſtinguiſhed by the word outward and viſible, but the repreſented ones are ſaid to be inward and inviſible; though in this caſe the repreſenting and repreſented objects are both of them, in reality and in the nature of things, outward and viſible; for who can ſay, that the body and blood of Chriſt were not corporeal things, equally outward and viſible as the bread and wine by which they are repreſented: So this repreſentation of things in this part of our moſt excellent catechiſm is founded on a mere logical diſtinction, which however, in its proper place, has its proper meaning and ſignificancy.

Secondly. When it is ſaid, *That the body and blood of Chriſt, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's ſupper,* if on the contrary it had been ſaid, *The body and blood of Chriſt, which are verily and indeed eaten and drank by the faithful in the Lord's ſupper,* this had been a tranſubſtantiated declaration, of which it had been impoſſible to get clear by any warrantable method of interpretation. Let us, therefore, thus tranſpoſe the words, which will make no difference in ſenſe and meaning, and ſay, bread and wine, which

which in the Lord's ſupper are verily and indeed taken by the faithful, and then we may give them the following juſt interpretation: ---

The body and blood of Chriſt, which, at the time or in the act of celebrating this ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, are verily and indeed taken into the mind of the faithful, [or of chriſtian communicants by faith (*i. e.* in reference to this ſacrament, by a faith in the reality of Chriſt's own ſacrifice of himſelf on the croſs, and in a remiſſion of ſins which is promiſed to the faithful through the merits of this ſacrifice). And this my interpretation of the word *taken*, is confirmed by ſeveral remarks on this point which occur in our learned and cloſe reaſoning apologiſt. *Etſi enim*, ſays our moſt excellent defender of our proteſtant faith, *Chriſti corpus dentibus et faucibus non attingimus, eum tamen fide, mente, ſpiritu, tenemus et premimus*. And if the prepoſition *in* ſhould be added to the word *fide*, it would certainly be more expreſſive and full to the point in queſtion. In another place he ſays to this purport: It is our faith or belief of Chriſt's ſacrifice which gives us the ſpiritual benefits of his death and crucifixion, and not the bare ſacrifice itſelf. And again

Saint Auguſtin ſays, that 'tis our faith or belief of a ſacrament which conferreth upon us the bleſſings of juſtification, and not the ſacrament itſelf.

It is ſaid by the papiſts, that our denying the bodily preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt is making a mere lifeleſs and unmeaning ceremony. In anſwer to which his lordſhip has given us this admirable defence of himſelf and of all proteſtant chriſtians : —

Chriſtum enim aſſerimus ſeſe vere præſentem exhibere in ſacramentis ſuis (meaning the univerſal preſence of his divinity) *in baptiſmo, ut eum induamus : In cæna, ut eum fide et ſpiritu comedamus: Atque dicimus non perfunctorie et frigide ; ſed re ipſa et vere fieri ; etſi enim Chriſti corpus dentibus et faucibus non attingimus, eum tamen fide, mente, et ſpiritu, tenemus et premimus. Neque vero vana ea fides eſt quæ Chriſtum complectitur, nec frigide percipitur quod fide, mente et ſpiritu percipitur.* This, I hope, will be thought ſufficient to exculpate the Church of England from the prejudiced and miſinterpreting diſſenters charge of tranſubſtantiation, and to vindicate her againſt a papiſtical charge of rendering the ſacrament

a

a mere lifeleſs and unmeaning ceremony, becauſe ſhe profeſſeth not to take the euchariſtical body and blood of Chriſt in any corporeal ſenſation, but to take it only in faith, in the grateful perceptions and acknowledgment of her mind and ſpirit.

This article is what I call religiouſly inſtructive, was intended to expreſs the goodneſs of God in conferring grace upon every one who rightly and duly receive the ſacraments, and to condemn the erroneous doctrine and practice of the Romiſh Church in her uſe of ſeven ſacraments; both which points, I apprehend may be honeſtly and conſcientiouſly ſubſcribed by every proteſtant divine.

ARTICLE 26. "Of the unworthineſs of the miniſters, which hinders not the effect of the ſacraments: Although in the viſible church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and ſometime the evil have chief authority in the miniſtration of the word and ſacraments; yet foraſmuch as they do not the ſame in their own name, but in Chriſt's, and do miniſter by his commiſſion and authority, we may uſe their miniſtry both in hearing the word of God, and in receiving of the ſacraments. Neither

is the effect of Chriſt's ordinance taken away by their wickedneſs, nor the grace of God's gift diminiſhed from ſuch as by faith and rightly do receive the ſacraments miniſtred unto them, which be effectual becauſe of Chriſt's inſtitution and promiſe, although they be miniſtred by evil men. Nevertheleſs it appertaineth to the diſcipline of the church, that enquiry be made of evil miniſters, and that they be accuſed by thoſe that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty, by juſt judgment be depoſed."

Firſt. Since the duty of public worſhip and a partaking of ſacraments are ſanctioned by divine authority, and when every one (as every member of our eſtabliſhed church muſt be) is fully ſatisfied in his own mind, that the manner and words of prayer in which he is to addreſs himſelf to the Almighty God and parent of the univerſe are perfectly conſiſtent with his own ideas of the nature and attributes of God, no one can juſtify himſelf in a neglect of theſe duties upon account of any thing exceptionable in the character of him who is rightly ordained to read his prayers, preach the word, and adminiſter the ſacraments.

But

But how a ſenſible man can reſolve to go to a conventicle, which he calls a place of public worſhip, with a deſign to addreſs himſelf to Almighty God in a language of prayer, of which he is ſuppoſed to be ignorant, and which may be left to the ſuggeſtions of (as the famous Sir Robert Walpole ſaid of Doctor Sachaverel in the Houſe of Commons) an hot brained, ungifted, and unedifying preacher and prayer, is an untoward matter of fact which I cannot eaſily account for.

Secondly. This article is what I call religiouſly inſtructive, having nothing in it exceptionable, or but what is perfectly congruous to the common ſenſe and reaſon of mankind, and thoroughly conſiſtent with the natural prerogatives of government, both civil and eccleſiaſtical.

ARTICLE 27. "Of Baptiſm: Baptiſm is not only a ſign of profeſſion and mark of difference, whereby chriſtian men are diſcerned from others that be not chriſtened, but it is alſo a ſign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an inſtrument, they that receive baptiſm rightly, are grafted into the church: The promiſes of the forgiveneſs of ſin, and of our adoption to be

be the ſons of God by the Holy Ghoſt, are viſibly ſigned and ſealed, faith is confirmed, and grace increaſed, by virtue of prayer unto God. The baptiſm of young children is in anywiſe to be retained in the church, as moſt agreeable to the inſtitution of Chriſt."

Firſt. It is natural to obſerve, as it has been already obſerved upon a like occaſion, that baptiſm, with the ſcriptural circumſtances of regeneration, has no meaning, unleſs it is applied to adult converts in the time of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, from judaiſm or idolatry, or to people of the preſent age who ſhall be converted from judaiſm, mohammediſm, or idolatry, or, in a moral view of things, to that change of mind, thought, and diſpoſition, which naturally ariſeth upon a wicked and profligate man's returning to the godly life and duties of a good chriſtian. For to talk of regeneration in a good man, who has been regularly baptized and educated in the principles of chriſtianity, has ſomething in it apparently abſurd and ridiculous.

This article falls under the denomination of being religiouſly inſtructive, having in its manner of deſcription ſome ſtriking marks

marks of genius, worthy a Jewel; nor has it any thing controverſial, unleſs when it falls into the hands of a Confeſſional, who is always diſpoſed to wrangle with common ſenſe, and eſpecially with whatever ſhall be ſanctioned by the legiſlative authority of a church or ſtate.

ARTICLE 28. "Of the Lord's ſupper: The ſupper of the Lord is not only a ſign of the love that chriſtians ought to have among themſelves one to another, but rather it is a ſacrament of our redemption by Chriſt's death, inſomuch, that to ſuch as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the ſame, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Chriſt, and likewiſe the cup of bleſſing is a partaking of the blood of Chriſt.

"Tranſubſtantiation (or the ſubſtance of bread and wine) in the ſupper of the Lord cannot be proved by holy writ, but it is repugnant to the plain words of ſcripture, overthroweth the nature of a ſacrament, and hath given occaſion to many ſuperſtitions.

"The body of Chriſt is given, taken and eaten in the ſupper only after an heavenly and

and ſpiritual manner, and the mean whereby the body of Chriſt is received and eaten in the ſupper, is faith. The ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper was not by Chriſt's ordinance reſerved, carried about, lifted up, or worſhipped."

That the ſame perſon who drew up the 25th article was principally or ſolely concerned in a compilation of this, upon a compariſon will appear undeniable; and the ſame paſſages from Biſhop Jewel's Apology may be pertinently applied to both.

ARTICLE 29. "The wicked, and ſuch as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and viſibly preſs with their teeth (as Saint Auguſtine ſaith) the ſacrament of the body and blood of Chriſt, yet are they in no wiſe partakers of Chriſt, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the ſign or ſacrament of ſo great a thing."

Firſt. The learned Dr. Bennet obſerves, that neither the title nor the body of this article are to be found in two copies which he diſtinguiſheth by the letters A. B. nor in a copy marked with W. meaning one of Mr. Wolfe's copies, who was one of the royal printers in Queen Elizabeth's reign, and

and perhaps in the year 1562 when the articles were firſt compiled, ſigned, and ratified, by the clerical and lay divines of convocation and parliament, but ſtill there are copies in which this article is to be found; and from whence it is highly reaſonable to conclude, that it muſt have made one of the original articles, ſigned, and ratified, as juſt mentioned, in the year 1562.

Secondly. This ſacrament is called, the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, or of the body and blood of Chriſt, of which bread and wine are the outward and viſible ſigns or repreſentatives; and theſe viſible ſigns every communicant is ſaid to eat and drink, but not (as the papiſts blaſphemouſly aſſert) to eat and drink the body and blood of Chriſt, which are repreſented by theſe outward and viſible ſigns. And Chriſt himſelf obſerves in a prophetic declaration, that whoſoever eateth not his fleſh, and drinketh not his blood, ſhall not be a partaker of the ſpiritual benefits and advantages which are promiſed to his true diſciples, or to thoſe who ſhall rightly and duly receive, by a right faith, and a life anſwerable to it, that ſacrament which he intended to inſtitute. So that every good chriſtian, as often as he hath opportunity of taking the ſacrament,

may be ſaid to repeat to himſelf an aſſurance of a remiſſion of all the ſins of his imperfect obedience, to which he has no right but through the merits of that ſacrifice, which in the act of celebrating this ſacrament, we particularly commemorate. For reaſons which it does not become me, as a mere mortal, to inquire into, a very conſiderable if not the greateſt part of the Holy Scriptures are cloathed in figurative, metaphorical, parabolical, and ænigmatical phraſes; and to bring theſe down to a level with common ſenſe, is the peculiar buſineſs of every judicious and practical divine. And it may juſtly be ſaid, that the Holy Scriptures, upon this account, are, and have been in the whole, or in part, a ſtandard of true taſte, fancy, imagination, genius, and ſublimity, to all good poets who ſtand upon hiſtorical record.

Thirdly. Whether this article was one of the original ones or not, is with me a matter of no great conſequence. That profligate and notorious ſinners who ſhall be occaſionally communicants without any ſerious notions of repentance and of their duty to God, without ſeriouſly conſidering the nature of the ſacrament, the deſign of its inſtitution, and the important ſpiritual

bleſſings

bleſſings to be derived from a lively faith in the divinity of Chriſt and in the merits of his ſacrifice, cannot be entitled to a remiſſion of all the deadly ſins of an imperfect obedience; of which divine remiſſion of ſins, every good, ſerious, and faithful communicant may be comfortably aſſured is a propoſition agreeable both to reaſon and ſcripture, and may at any time be readily ſubſcribed by every clerical divine of our eſtabliſhed church.

ARTICLE 30. "Of both kinds or parts of the Sacrament: The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people; for both parts of the Lord's ſacrament, by Chriſt's ordinance and commandment, ought to be miniſtred to all chriſtian men alike."

That for many centuries it has been the practice of the Romiſh Church not to give the ſacrament of wine to the laity, is an undeniable matter of fact: And after a few remarks I ſhall produce ſome paſſages from our learned apologiſt, to prove the inconſiſtency of ſuch a practice with that of the primitive and moſt pure ages of chriſtianity.

First. The ſame divine bleſſings are annexed to both ſacraments, for the preventing, aſſiſting, and co-operating grace of God, with our own good endeavours and reſolutions to lead a chriſtian and divine life, and a remiſſion of all the ſins of an imperfect obedience, are peculiar bleſſings, which at the time of celebrating theſe ſacraments we are directed to pray for, and to give ourſelves the moſt comfortable aſſurance of obtaining.

Secondly. If it had been the revealed will of Chriſt, that the bread only ſhould be adminiſtred to the congregation, I ſhould not impertinently and blaſphemouſly inquire into any particular reaſons for ſuch a mode of religious conduct, which I was fully ſatisfied that infinite wiſdom had preſcribed: But ſince nothing of this kind occurs in the Holy Scriptures, and ſince it is highly abſurd to ſuppoſe, that different or contrary things ſhould be divinely required of the prieſt and people for the ſalvation of ſouls, this practice of the Romiſh Church may juſtly be declared repugnant both to reaſon and ſcripture

And thus our learned apologiſt expreſſeth himſelf in defence of our reformed and eſtabliſhed

eſtabliſhed church, and as one particular important reaſon for ſeperating from a communion with that of Rome: *Nos enim cum Chriſto, Apoſtolis et ſanctis patribus Euchariſtiam populo damus integram: Iſti contra omnes patres, contra omnes Apoſtolos, contra Chriſtum ipſum, cum ſummo, ut Gelaſius ait, ſacrilegio, ſacramenta dividunt, et alteram partem populo eripiunt.* And in another place, where he is ſpeaking of a determination on this point by Calixtus, he thus fully and pertinently declares,--- *Sic enim ait Apoſtolos ſtatuiſſe* (and alluding alſo to the ancient practice of the Romiſh Church itſelf), *et ſanctam Romanam Eccleſiam tenere, populo ad ſacram communionem accedenti, utramque partem Euchariſtiæ tradendam eſſe. Id enim et Chriſtum juſſiſſe, et Apoſtolos ubique terrarum inſtituiſſe, et omnes veteres patres, et Catholicos Epiſcopos ſecutos eſſe.* Upon every erroneous and unſcriptural doctrine of the Romiſh Church, which is exhibited and condemned in the articles, our literate apologiſt is full in hiſtorical facts, and concluſive in argument. It being only my deſign to produce a few paſſages which are pertinent and applicable to the point under immediate conſideration, in order to prove, in the utmoſt degree of probability, that the articles

cles were planned and drawn up by this our pious and learned reformiſt: And I ſhall only add, that it muſt be a matter of great ſurprize that Mr. Lindſey and Jebb, with a few learned and judicious divines amongſt the petitioning clergy, ſhould have reaſon to repent of having declared, by a ſubſcription, this practice of the Romiſh Church to be, what in reality it is, repugnant both to reaſon and ſcripture.

ARTICLE 31. "Of the one oblation of Chriſt finiſhed upon the croſs: The offering of Chriſt once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and ſatisfaction, for all the ſins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other ſatisfaction for ſin, but that alone: Wherefore, the ſacrifices of maſſes, in the which it was commonly ſaid, that the prieſt did offer Chriſt for the quick and the dead, to have remiſſion of pain or guilt, were blaſphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

Firſt. Whoever compares this part of the ſecond article, *That Chriſt is a ſacrifice not only for original guilt, but alſo for actual ſins of men*, with theſe words of the thirty-firſt, *The offering of Chriſt is a ſatisfaction for all the ſins of the whole world, both original*

original and actual, will be inclined to think, that the ſame great man was concerned in a compilation of both. And his lordſhip in this article has proved himſelf to be literately verſed in the hiſtorical and modern practice (with regard to his own time) of the Roman Church, and has diſplayed his great abilities in a proper application of his logic and philoſophy.

Secondly. The two propoſitions of this article are, *That the offering of Chriſt once made is a perfect redemption, propitiation, and ſatisfaction, for all the ſins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is no other ſatisfaction for ſin, but that alone: Wherefore,* in conſequence of this propoſition, the truth of which is granted even by the Church of Rome itſelf, *the ſacrifices of maſſes, in the which it is commonly ſaid, that the prieſt did offer Chriſt for the quick and dead,* or has a right to repeat the ſacrifice of Chriſt for the quick and the dead, *to have remiſſion of pain and guilt,* or that living and ſinful creatures may obtain a remiſſion of ſins here, and that the dead may obtain a remiſſion of pain in a purgatorial ſtate of puniſhment, *were blaſphemous fables, and dangerous deceits,* or muſt be blaſphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

Thirdly.

Thirdly. His lordſhip's manner of reaſoning, and the reſult of it, is evidently this: If, with regard to good men and ſincere penitents, that ſacrifice which Chriſt was graciouſly pleaſed to make of himſelf on the croſs, by the hands of unreaſonable and wicked men, was accepted by God the Father as a full and perfect ſatisfaction for all the ſins of an imperfect obedience, it is abſurd to ſuppoſe, that any other ſacrifices ſhould be required for a remiſſion of daily ſins, when the ſacrifice of Chriſt is declared to be ſufficient for the ſins of a man's whole life. A few paſſages, the moſt pertinent and condemning of the Romiſh doctrine of purgatory, have been already produced; and the ordinary practice of popiſh maſſes, or daily ſacrifices of Chriſt for a remiſſion of pain and guilt in purgatory and in the preſent world, are thus deſcribed in the way of a quæſtioning appeal to the Church of Rome, for the unſcripturalneſs and abſurdity of this religious practice:--- *Apoſtolos Chriſti vetereſque patres dixiſſe privatas miſſas in omnibus angulis templorum, modo denas modo vicenas uno die.* And indeed in many different places of the Apology the purchaſe and diſtribution of maſſes for this purpoſe are accurarely delineated. Nor is it eaſy to conceive, that a ſincere proteſtant

can

can think himſelf grieved by a ſubſcription to the unreaſonableneſs of a doctrine and practice which is alſo directly repugnant to the plaineſt documents of revelation.

ARTICLE 32. "Of the marriage of prieſts: Biſhops, prieſts, and deacons, are not commanded by God's law either to vow the eſtate of ſingle life, or to abſtain from marriage: Therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other chriſtian men, to marry at their own diſcretion, as they ſhall judge the ſame to ſerve better to godlineſs."

Firſt. To increaſe and multiply in a matrimonial ſtate, under the directions of love and prudence, is certainly the univerſal will and command of the infinitely wiſe parent of the univerſe, who upon ſeeing every thing which he had made, declared it to be very good. Two probable reaſons perhaps may be given for a traditional ſuperſeding of this divine injunction; one of theſe, in favour of a cælibacal prieſthood, I had from a perſon who is no enemy to catholics or papiſts,--- *Firſt*, That it was intended to ſupport temporal riches, grandeur, and magnificence, in the church, becauſe church-batchelors are naturally inclined to devote their fortune to the ſervice

and emoluments of the prieſthood; --- *Secondly*, It is not improbable, though I never ſaw it poſitively aſſerted, but this cælibacal practice might receive its principal ſanction from the example which Chriſt himſelf was pleaſed to afford; though, conſidering a temporary union between the human and divine perſon of Chriſt, how abſurd and ridiculous above meaſure muſt it be to ſuppoſe, that he, who in his divine perſon was a father not only of the whole world but of the whole univerſe, ſhould reſolve to make uſe of his humanity for the increaſe of fleſhly tabernacles; but however theſe things be, our learned apologiſt expoſeth and confutes this ſuperſtitious and abſurd practice of popery, in the following manner: --- *Matrimonium in omni genere et ſtatu hominum, in patriarchis, in prophetis, in Apoſtolis, in ſanctis martyribus, in miniſtris Eccleſiarum, in Epiſcopis ſanctum et honorificum eſſe dicimus; et, ut Chryſoſtomus ait, fas et jus eſſe cum eo ad cathedram Epiſcopalem aſcendere; utque Sozomenus ait de ſpiridione, et Nazianzenus de patre ſuo, Epiſcopum pium, et induſtrium nihilo deterius ea cauſa, immo melius etiam et utilius verſari in miniſterio: Legem autem illam quæ hominibus eam libertatem per vim adimat et invitos adigat ad cælibatum, eſſe, ut divus Paulus ait,*

doctrinam

doctrinam dæmoniarum.---- As an inſtance of the higheſt oddity in conception, attended with the moſt abominable impiety in ſentiment and language, I ſhall here preſent the reader with the following, for a monſter both of his pity and indignation: *Meminerit Cardinalem Campegium* (who was ſent by the Pope to diſſolve the marriage between King Henry and his wife Katharine) *Albertum Pighium, alioſque complures ſuos docuiſſe, ſacerdotem illum multo ſanctius et caſtius vivere qui alat concubinam quam qui uxorem habeat in matrimonio.* And if it is not impertinent to aſk a ſerious quæſtion, Why ſhould a married proteſtant take it into his head, that his peace of mind can be any way diſturbed by pronouncing a religious doctrine and practice of this nature to be inconſiſtent with reaſon and the genuine precepts of the goſpel?

ARTICLE 33. "Of excommunicate perſons: That perſon, which by open denunciation of the church, and is rightly cut off from the unity of the church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an heathen and publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the church by a judge that hath authority thereunto."

Firſt. In the Apoſtles' time indeed, and during the whole three centuries between Chriſt and the firſt Chriſtian Emperor Conſtantine, atheiſm, impiety, and blaſphemy, of every ſort, againſt the true and unknown God of chriſtians, could not be puniſhed by human laws; but when chriſtianity was eſtabliſhed, ſanctioned, and ſupported, by the legiſlative authority of chriſtian emperors, kings, or civil magiſtrates, then all offences of this nature were made puniſhable by certain written laws and ordinances: And this article was plainly intended to expreſs the reaſonableneſs of a certain godly and wholeſome diſcipline, for the puniſhment of ſuch offences, in every chriſtian country, under every form of civil government.

Secondly. In Biſhop Jewel's Apology, in which he is explaining this difficult and remarkable text of Evangelical Scripture, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, &c.* his lordſhip has diſplayed a divine ſenſe and judgment, ſhewing us what ill uſe the Church of Rome hath made of it, and what uſe may, ought, and has been made of it by our excellent and reformed Church of England. And the following paſſage directly correſponds to the

the literal and grammatical ſenſe of the article under immediate conſideration : --- *Eos qui gravi ſcandalo, et notabili publicoque aliquo delicto, fratrum animos offenderint, et ſeſe a communi ſocietate Eccleſiæ, et a Chriſti corpore quodammodo abalienarint, reſpiſcilentes, reconciliet, et infidelium cœtum recolligat et reſtituat.*

To inſtitute a godly diſcipline for puniſhing the atheiſtical and impious offences of notorious ſinners, muſt ſurely be reaſonable and expedient ; nor is it eaſy to conceive but that a ſubſcribing to the reaſonableneſs of it may be done, not only without offering any violence to a good conſcience, but with its moſt ready aſſent and approbation.

ARTICLE 34. " Of the traditions of the church : It is not neceſſary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly alike ; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diverſity of countries, times, and men's manners. Whoſoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purpoſely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and

and approved of by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth againſt the common order of the church, and hurteth the authority of the magiſtrate, and woundeth the conſciences of the weak brethren. Every particular and national church hath authority to ordain, change, and aboliſh, ceremonies or rites of the church, ordained only by man's authority, ſo that all things be done to edifying."

Firſt. By tradition, in matters of religion, I mean ſome religious rite or ceremony which is received and practiced upon the authority, opinion, or judgment of our anceſtors, being allowed at the time of practiſing it neceſſary and expedient, having nothing in it apparently repugnant to reaſon and ſcripture.

Secondly. By traditions and ceremonies, ordained and approved by common authority, I mean ſuch as are ordained and approved, or ratified, by the legiſlative authority of the civil magiſtrate, becauſe nothing can be ordained or eſtabliſhed, as obligatory, upon the ſubjects of any country, but what is ſanctioned or ratified by the legiſlative authority of the civil magiſtrate.

ſtrate. From whence it may be ſaid, that this article contains the three following propoſitions.

Firſt. That ſince the religious rites and ceremonies of our chriſtian church were not given and ordained by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, and are the commandments of mere human authority, they may at any time be changed or altered, as the chriſtian civil magiſtrate, in council with learned and eminent divines, ſhall at any time determine. And if even our lutheran and calviniſtical diſſidents themſelves, in alliance with the petitioning clergy, did not aſſent to the truth of this propoſition, why did they apply to the civil magiſtrate for any change or abolition of ſuch religious rites and ceremonies.

Secondly. That whoever does openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the church, which be not repugnant to the will of God, or ſhall be declared not to be repugnant to the will of God, and be ordained and approved or ratified by the legiſlative authority of the civil magiſtrate, may be puniſhed at his diſcretion for contumacy.

Thirdly. That every particular and national

tional church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies, or rites of the church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying; the civil magistrate indeed may tolerate, permit, or suffer a contradiction to his authority, but such a permission does not destroy that right, or authority of the civil magistrate, to which I have subscribed. There is such a consanguinity of meaning and design between this and the 21st, 22d, and 23d articles, that whatever hath been cited from the Apology, with particular observations and arguments relative to these, may be pertinently applied to this.

Article 35. "Of Homilies: The second book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people."

First. Even the Confessional himself allows, that the Homilies were principally intended

intended to reprobate and condemn the erroneous doctrines and ſuperſtitions of popery; and ſince they contain very ſenſible exhortations againſt rebellion and idleneſs, againſt gluttony and drunkenneſs, with equally ſenſible obſervations concerning prayer, the worthy receiving of the ſacrament of the body and blood of Chriſt, and the important duty of repentance, and ſeveral other duties, clearly ſanctioned by the dictates of reaſon and authorities of Holy Scripture, who, except a lunatic or a puritan, can think his conſcience grieved by a declaration, that this book of Homilies does contain a godly and wholeſome doctrine. But, however, this Confeſſional has defiled ſome very good paper with an unedifying and ſneering kind of raillery, concerning ſome very terrible wounds which conſcience muſt be ſuppoſed to receive by ſuch a declarative ſubſcription: Though it is to be hoped, however pitiable is the caſe of Mr. Lindſey and Jebb, that the bulk of our clerical divines will not be puſillanimous enough to be ſneered out of their religion, which, in the judgment of the learned Jewel and judicious Hooker, have a moſt deſirable warrant from the plaineſt documents of revelation, for the authority of Jewel and Hooker is

more than equal to a million of authorities from the beſt written books of preſbytery and independents. And I ſhall only add, that I defy any one, who is but tolerably well verſed in the nature of logic and in the buſineſs of philoſophy, to produce one argument from this boaſted Confeſſional which is logically conſtructed and philoſophically illuſtrated; I mean ſuch a logically conſtructed argument as ſhall be founded on ſome ſelf-evident propoſition; for that argument which is founded on no ſelf-evident propoſition to be conceded by an opponent, or from the reaſon and nature of things, is, with me, to be held in no eſtimation of an argument at all.

ARTICLE 36. "Of conſecration of biſhops and miniſters: The book of conſecration of archbiſhops and biſhops, and ordering of prieſts and deacons, lately ſet forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the ſame time by authority of parliament, doth contain all things neceſſary to ſuch conſecration and ordering: Neither hath it any thing that of itſelf is ſuperſtitious and ungodly: And therefore, whoſoever are conſecrated or ordered according to the rights of that book, ſince the ſecond year of the forenamed

named King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter ſhall be conſecrated or ordered, according to the ſame rites, we decree all ſuch to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully conſecrated and ordered."

Firſt. Though the power and authority, or conſent and approbation of the Pope, in the conſecration of biſhops and ordination of prieſts, are not mentioned and condemned, yet this article has evidently a ſecret view to the declaring an abolition of papal authority in this part of eccleſiaſtical government; for it can hardly be ſaid, that the Pope's authority was abſolutely and peremptorily denied and excluded before the reign of King Edward the Sixth. Agreeable to this obſervation I therefore ſtate the two leading propoſitions of this article in the following manner: That the chriſtian civil magiſtrate, of every diſtinct and ſeparate chriſtian country and government, hath a right to ratify by his legiſlative authority any religious form of conſecrating and ordaining biſhops and prieſts, without any interference in this matter of the conſent and approbation of the Pope; and that all perſons conſecrated and ordained, according to ſuch a form, are rightly, orderly, and lawfully conſecrated and ordained.

In either view of the two propoſitions which are exhibited in this article, they muſt appear highly important to the cauſe of that public or national liberty, which every ſincere proteſtant is ſuppoſed to aſſert and defend, and of which importance he ought to be reminded by a ſubſcription. The aſſerted power of the civil magiſtrate in this article exactly correſponds with what is claimed in the 20th, 21ſt, and 23d; and upon theſe, all arguments to be taken from the reaſon and nature of things, from the plain documents of revelation, and from the authority of our learned compiler, have been particularly conſidered for determining the point in controverſy, relative to the natural rights, privileges, and prerogatives of the civil magiſtrate of every diſtinct nation, in matters of religion or eccleſiaſtical government.

ARTICLE 37. "Of the civil magiſtrate: The Queen's majeſty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all eſtates of this realm, whether they be eccleſiaſtical or civil, in all cauſes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be ſubject to any foreign juriſdiction: Where we attribute to the Queen's majeſty the chief

chief government (by which titles we underſtand the minds of ſome ſlanderous folks to be offended), we give not to our princes the miniſtring either of God's word or of the ſacraments; the which thing the injunctions alſo, lately ſet forth by Elizabeth our queen, do moſt plainly teſtify; but that only prerogative, which we ſee to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scripture by God himſelf; that is, that they ſhould rule all eſtates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be eccleſiaſtical or temporal, and reſtrain with the civil ſword the ſtubborn and evil doers.

"The Biſhop of Rome hath no juriſdiction in this realm of England. The laws of the realm may puniſh chriſtian men with death for heinous and grievous offences. It is lawful for chriſtian men, at the commandment of the magiſtrate, to wear weapons, and ſerve in the wars."

Firſt. Upon our Bleſſed Saviour's aſking his diſciples what was the opinion of the world concerning him, St. Peter declares, that thou art Chriſt, the Son of the living God. Upon which it is ſaid in the following verſe, Bleſſed art thou Simon Barjona; for

fleſh

fleſh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I ſay alſo unto thee, that thou art Peter, whoſe name anſwereth to that of a rock, and upon this rock, not upon the rock of Peter (for I do not apprehend, that the ludicrous buſineſs of a punſter is conſiſtent with the divine dignity of Chriſt), but upon this rock, Chriſt, the Son of the living God, in oppoſition to the lifeleſs gods of idolatry, will I build my church, and the gates of hell, or all the ſanatical powers of idolatry, ſhall not be able to procure its overthrow or deſtruction. And I do authorize thee, and every other perſon who ſhall be properly called to the miniſtry, to declare, in the exerciſe of his miniſterial office, a remiſſion of all the ſins of an imperfect obedience, according to the revealed documents and conditions of my goſpel covenant. Theſe doctrines are evidently contained in the following figurative or metaphorical expreſſions: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on earth ſhall be bound in heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on earth ſhall be looſed in heaven."

Firſt. This kingdom muſt evidently be the one immenſe kingdom of the univerſe, which

which is perpetually and neceſſarily preſenced and directed by the one living God, in oppoſition to the divided and heavenly kingdoms of idolatry.

Secondly. From an univerſal belief of being accountable for our actions at ſome future tribunal, and from a conſciouſneſs of exiſting in the character of ſinners and rebels againſt the righteous laws of an heavenly judge, it was an act of the higheſt goodneſs to introduce this kingdom into the minds of men with a poſitive command to repent, ſaying, *Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand:* For a ſincere repentance, with proper acknowledgments of dependence and unworthineſs, through the merits of Chriſt, are the conditions upon which a remiſſion of all the paſt ſins of an imperfect obedience, and the joyous expectations of ſalvation are graciouſly promiſed.

Thirdly. Since this particular commiſſion was given by our Bleſſed Saviour at Jeruſalem, and ſince St. Peter never claimed and exerciſed any kind of pre-eminence or excluſive juriſdiction, why the Biſhop of Rome in preference to the Biſhop of any other province ſhould claim an univerſal

and

and eccleſiaſtical monarchy may be juſtly pronounced ænigmatically abſurd and ridiculous, as our learned apologiſt has thus declared :---*Cyprianus ait, pari omnes inter ſe fuiſſe poteſtate; atque hoc idem fuiſſe alios quod Petrus fuit, omnibus ex æquo dictum fuiſſe, paſcite; omnibus, ite in mundum univerſum; omnibus, docete Evangelium: Et ut ait Hieronymus, omnes Epiſcopos ubique tandem ſint, ſive Romæ, ſive Eugubii, ſive Conſtantinopoli, ſive Rhegii, ejuſdem eſſe meriti et ſacerdotii.*

In the end of this article it is ſaid, *That the laws of the realm may puniſh chriſtian men with death for heinous and grievous offences. It is lawful for chriſtian men at the commandment of the magiſtrate to wear weapons, and ſerve in the wars.* The reaſon of making theſe propoſitions a part of a religious article, to us, in the preſent age, is not evident, but it muſt be abſurd for a ſenſible man to ſay, that his conſcience is any way diſturbed by a ſubſcription. And to all ſuch oppoſers of an eſtabliſhment, I here apply this declaration of our Bleſſed Saviour's to the prejudiced and malicious Jews, ſaying, *Ye blind guides, who ſtrain at a gnat and ſwallow a camel.*

ARTICLE 38. "Of chriſtian men's goods which are not common: The riches and goods of chriſtians are not common, as touching the right, title, and poſſeſſion of the ſame, as certain anabaptiſts do falſely boaſt; notwithſtanding, every man ought of ſuch things as he poſſeſſeth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability."

Firſt. No doubt but this article was deſigned to reprobate and condemn an opinion which is inconſiſtent with, and has a natural tendency to encourage people of inferior and ſervile conditions, in all caſes of real want, or pretended poverty, to violate the primary laws of all human ſocieties. The right or title of one man to the riches or goods of another, is an abſurd doctrine, which was originally advanced and maintained by a particular religious ſect, commonly diſtinguiſhed by the appellation of quakers or anabaptiſts, and had its riſe from a miſinterpreted practice of the primitive chriſtians in every ſucceeding period of perſecution, from the time of our Saviour's aſcenſion, to that of the Emperor Conſtantine.

Secondly. It was abſolutely requiſite, that chriſtians, in a ſtate of perſecution,

when they were excluded from the charitable liberality, and even from the common benefits of civil ſociety, to make one common ſtock of temporalities, or, in ſcripture language, to have all things common, from which the helpleſs, through the infirmities of age or of accidental misfortune, might be ſupplied at the diſcretionary will of thoſe to whom the care and management of this public ſtock was particularly entruſted. Nor did the inferior and diſtreſſed chriſtians, in the unhappy days of perſecution, imagine, that one man had ſuch an abſolute right or title to the property of another as to take arbitrarily and by violence what they ſhould think requiſite for a decent ſubſiſtence: And therefore, as I have juſt obſerved, the anabaptiſts giving ſuch an abſolute right or title to one man over the temporal poſſeſſions of another, proceeded from a miſinterpreted practice of the firſt chriſtian ſocieties. Nor could any civil government ſubſiſt under an univerſal belief and practice of ſuch a right amongſt inferior, ſervile, and labouring ſubjects of every denomination. And whereas a particular religious ſect of chriſtians, who are called anabaptiſts, had a religious article, whoſe doctrine is deſtructive of the very being, it was natural for the Church of England

England to adopt a contrary one, which had a natural tendency to preſerve the peace and concord of all human ſocieties. And no doubt but this our 38th article was deſigned as a counteract to this anabaptiſtical abſurd and pernicious double doctrine of civil and eccleſiaſtical polity. And of the antiquity of this religious ſectary our learned apologiſt has given the following account: *Fatemur, quidem, novas quaſdam et antea non auditas ſectas, Anabaptiſtas, Libertinos, Menonios, Zuenkfeldianos ſtatim ad Exortum Evangelii extitiſſe. Verum agimus Deo noſtro gratias, ſatis jam orbis terrarum videt, nos nec peperiſſe, nec docuiſſe, nec aluiſſe iſta monſtra.*

Thirdly. That any particular perſons ſhould imagine and aſſert, that Jeſus Chriſt intended to carry off his two ſacraments, of Baptiſm, and of that commonly called the Lord's Supper, in a figurative fire, is an evomition of ſomething which juſtly entitles them, in the language of our apologiſt, to be conſidered as monſters of error, monſters of pity, and monſters of contradiction to the mind of Chriſt, and to a religion eſtabliſhed upon the judgment of the moſt eminent, learned, and judicious divines. And I ſhall only add, that theſe

our Engliſh diſſidents being not accuſtomed, and having no ability to make logical diſtinctions and philoſophical arguments, have never learned to diſtinguiſh what is, or is not, neceſſary to be done, in the oppoſite conditions of perſecution and an eſtabliſhment: For ſince the civil chriſtian magiſtrate hath made a legal proviſion for his poor ſubjects of every denomination, the quakers, in imitation of the practice of the primitive and perſecuted chriſtians, erecting a public fund for the relief of the poor, is a demonſtration of great ignorance, in not properly diſcerning what is or is not neceſſary to be done by thoſe who profeſs an untolerated or an eſtabliſhed religion. The two propoſitions of this article, *That the riches and goods of chriſtians are not common, as touching the right, title, and poſſeſſion of the ſame, as certain anabaptiſts do falſely boaſt, and that every one ought of ſuch things as he poſſeſſeth liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability*, theſe propoſitions, I ſay, are both conſpicuous and agreeable to the common ſenſe and reaſon of mankind; and whoever pretends to have a conſcience offended by a ſubſcription, may be juſtly ſaid to have a tenderneſs of conſcience unwarranted by reaſon or ſcripture.

ARTICLE 39. "Of a chriſtian man's oath: As we confeſs, that vain and raſh ſwearing is forbidden chriſtian men by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt and James his apoſtle, ſo we judge, that chriſtian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may ſwear when the magiſtrate requireth, in a cauſe of faith and charity, ſo it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in juſtice, judgment, and truth."

No doubt but this article was intended to counteract another abſurd doctrine of theſe anabaptiſts, in which it is aſſerted, that the practice of adminiſtring and taking an oath in public courts of judicature is contrary to the plain documents of revelation; and this doctrine is founded on the following paſſage of Holy Scripture, *Let your communication be yea, yea, nay and nay, and whatſoever is more than theſe cometh of evil.* But theſe ſilly women and handicraft interpreters of holy writ never conſidered that the original divine preacher of the goſpel never intended to ſay any thing, nor was in a ſituation of life to determine any thing, about the propriety or impropriety, legality or illegality, the inefficiency or utility of adminiſtring and taking an oath in public courts of judicature; and it may

may juſtly be ſaid, that the reaſonableneſs and neceſſity of doing ſo is founded entirely on one of the laws, ſtatutes, and ordinances, which are to be ſeen in the moſaic and divine ſyſtem of eccleſiaſtical and civil polity. For Almighty God, who knoweth beſt what is in man, or by what reaſons and motives he is moſt powerfully influenced, has expreſſly commanded, that in matters of diſpute between man and man, all public evidences to be given to the truth ſhall be introduced by a ſolemn appeal to himſelf for a confirmation of it. And ſo long as the religion of theiſm ſhall be the univerſal religion of civilized nations even to the end of the world, this practice of adminiſtring and taking an oath in public courts of judicature will, and ought to be continued. And I ſhall only add, that the plain ſenſe and doctrine of this laſt article naturally gives occaſion to call upon us in all caſes in which the honour of God and the peace of ſociety is concerned, to make a ſolemn appeal to the wiſdom, the power, and majeſty of that one true and living God, whoſe glorious attributes are in the firſt article ſo conſpicuouſly and amiably delineated.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER VII.

HAVING, in the former part of this Work, examined, and I hope given a ſatisfactory confutation to this complicated objection of modern and ancient diſſidents, againſt ſubſcribing to the thirty-nine articles of our eſtabliſhed church, that the deſign of compiling them is not apparent, that the perſons principally concerned in their compilation is unevident, that they are dreſſed up in terms which favour no ſide of any given propoſitions, that the ſenſe of the articles themſelves and that of the church, are different from and ſometimes contrary to each other, and that in a literal conſtruction of words in which they are expreſſed they are myſterious or unintelligible, I ſhall here proceed to an examination of ſome other objections, which, upon enquiry, will be found to be equally unſupported by any rules of logic or ſound philoſophy. The firſt of theſe is held out to us in the following propoſition, which may be read in a remarkable and popular performance, called a free inquiry into the nature and origin of evil. The propoſition is this: That all religious teſts and ſubſcriptions are in their own nature ſubverſive of truth and morals, yet folly and knavery

knavery will ſcarcely permit any government to ſubſiſt without them. From the manner and place in which this poſition is introduced, and from the few following ſpecious pretences to argument againſt the credibility of any revelation, and of conſequence againſt that of the chriſtian, it can be doing no injuſtice to the author of this enquiry, if we take it for granted that he deſigned to take into his ſweep of religious teſts a ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles of the eſtabliſhed Church of England. And thus we proceed to argue as logicians, on the other ſide of the queſtion :---If the religious teſt of a ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles is ſubverſive of truth and morals, then the ſeveral propoſitions of which theſe articles conſiſt muſt be ſubverſive of truth and morals (and it is to be preſumed, that the author of this enquiry means good morals). Now our religious teſt requires a ſubſcription to the following propoſitions : — That there is one living and true God, everlaſting, without body, parts, or paſſions, of infinite power, wiſdom, and goodneſs, the maker and preſerver of all things, both viſible and inviſible. — To the divinity of Chriſt and of the Holy Ghoſt, to Chriſt's incarnation, crucifixion, reſurrection, and aſcenſion. To the

the certainty of a future ſtate, to the neceſſity of leading a good life, as an eſſential recommendation to the favour of God. That tranſubſtantiation, purgatory, works of ſupererogation, the worſhipping of ſaints and images, are repugnant to reaſon and ſcripture. And in this our religious teſt a direct acknowledgment is required, that neither the pope, nor any foreign potentate, has a right to exerciſe any civil or eccleſiaſtical authority within the realms of England.

Firſt. That a man who profeſſeth himſelf a Member of a proteſtant ſociety ſhould declare, that both folly and knavery are concerned in demanding and giving an aſſent to theſe propoſitions, is ſomething which muſt deſerve of every honeſt and pious man both pity and indignation. To ſay, that an aſſent to the being, the natural and moral perfections, and providence of God, is ſubverſive of truth and good morals, is ſurely a falſhood, a blaſphemy and impiety of an execrable nature, and implieth an inſult to the one true and living God of the univerſe, to the religion, to the eccleſiaſtical and civil governors of his country, which I hope, that he who hath ſaid it will live long enough to repent of, and to explain what particular propo-

ſitions are contained in that religious teſt which he has declared enemies of truth and good morals. But in a ſpirit of true chriſtian charity we will ſuppoſe, that when he had mounted his hobby horſe and was riding he knew not where, he inadvertently took the road which led to atheiſm, deiſm, and popery. I cannot help obſerving here how highly probable it is, that the author of this Inquiry and of the Confeſſional had never read the thirty-nine articles, becauſe all their poſitive and declamatory evomitions againſt them, cannot charitably be imputed to any thing elſe but ignorance. It is very poſſible indeed, that the author of this inquiry may call upon Lindſey, Jebb, and the petitioning clergy, to confirm his charge againſt the thirty-nine articles, that, conſidered as a religious teſt, they are ſubverſive of truth and morals; and indeed in the wholeſale way of dealing, which is a very unfair and unreaſonable one, they have joined company with atheiſts, deiſts, and papiſts. But the petitioning clergy have never declared in direct and poſitive terms, that a conſciouſneſs of having ſubſcribed to the being and perfections of God, as particularly expreſſed in the firſt of the thirty-nine articles, to the divinity of Chriſt and

of

of the Holy Ghoſt, and to the repugnancy of tranſubſtantiation and purgatory to reaſon and ſcripture, is attended with any diſquietude of mind; nor have they ever declared directly and poſitively, that to give an aſſent to theſe propoſitions has a natural tendency to ſubvert truth and morals. And ſince to petition to be exempted from ſubſcribing to theſe articles does juſtly incur a ſuſpicion of atheiſm, deiſm, and popery, the duty, I think, which they owe to themſelves, and to ſociety at large, calls upon them to give ſome plauſible pretence how a petition of this nature can be fairly diſcharged from an imputation of what, as theiſts, chriſtians, and proteſtant chriſtians, they profeſs an utter deteſtation and abhorrence‡.

‡ One Francis Stone, who was the late ſecretary to the ſociety of the petitioning clergy, hath uſhered a ſtrange book into the univerſal and undiſtinguiſhing republic of letters; in which he hath openly propoſed an alienation of church lands towards diſcharging the national debt, leaving his maſters and all the other clerical members of our eſtabliſhed church in the ragged condition of quack-doctors, being left to procure the emoluments of a decent ſubſiſtence by ſome vociferous method of convocating a numerous and benevolent audience. But if I rightly underſtand the religious notions and principles of the petitioning clergy, this duple doctrine divine hath abundantly exceeded his commiſſion, nor upon a ſimilar occaſion can he reaſonably expect to be preferred again to an office of ſuch reſpectable dignity.

I have three pamphlets which were publiſhed and much read in Oxford, during the late controverſy concerning the reaſonableneſs and expediency of requiring a ſubſcription to the thirty nine articles from young gentlemen in the univerſities of Cambridge and Oxford upon their matriculation. In theſe the objections of our calviniſtical and lutheran diſſidents are candidly conſidered and ſatisfactorily confuted by the learned and ingenious Dr. Randolph. One of theſe pamphlets is called an anſwer to a pamphlet, entitled reflections on the impropriety and inexpediency of lay ſubſcription to the thirty-nine articles. In this Dr. Randolph has candidly conſidered and ſatisfactorily confuted the objections of our calviniſtical and lutheran diſſidents, by ſhewing that the practice of requiring a ſubſcription was almoſt coœval with a ratification of the articles. And though the noble Leiceſter, as chancellor of the univerſity, holds out but a motley character, pretending with one hand a zeal for the ſupport of our eſtabliſhed church, and with the other giving a ſecret encouragement to the factious machinations of puritans and fanatics, yet ſtill this nobleman ſpake the ſentiments of the queen and of the great men of the realm, by recommending a

ſubſcription

ſubſcription as one of the beſt and moſt natural ſecurities of our eſtabliſhed church.

In a diſſertation on the 17th article, which was publiſhed in Oxford in the year 1772, we have a faithful account of Calvin's impious and blaſphemous notions concerning the ſcriptural doctrine of predeſtination. *Reprobi,* ſays this abſurd interpreter of Holy Scripture, *Dei judicio ſuſcitati ſunt ad gloriam ejus ſua damnatione illuſtrandam*; but ſurely the divine nor human governor of this kingdom do conſider the reaſonableneſs and neceſſity of inflicting puniſhment on notorious offenders as contributing any thing to the honour and glory of government, but rather as ſomething which is no leſs a diſcredit both to rationality and government. And there is an odd circumſtance on this point, highly worth notice, that our calviniſtical diſſidents in England and Scotland ſhould reſolve to reprobate a ſubſcription to an article, which they allow may be interpreted in a ſenſe in which they are every ſabbath-day diſpenſing it to the congregated members of their reſpective conventicles. To this diſſertation on the 17th article is added a ſhort tract, in which it is proved by a judicious divine of our eſtabliſhed

liſhed church, that the declaration annexed to the book of the thirty-nine articles was not introduced in the reign of James, but in that of Charles the firſt. And in the ſecond edition of the Confeſſional, the author of it acknowledgeth himſelf to have been too haſty and culpable, in having aſſerted a matter of fact, for which he had not ſufficient authority. So that here amongſt the ſeveral objections to a ſubſcription in general, and eſpecially from young gentlemen in the univerſities upon their matriculation, I ſhall attempt to confute the unreaſonableneſs of this univerſal one, that the propoſitions of which the thirty-nine articles conſiſt are of profound argument, of a mixed nature, hiſtorical, theological, and metaphyſical.

Firſt. From the characteriſtical manner in which our opponents write of the articles, they give juſt ground of ſuſpicion, that either they have not read them, or that they never attended to the particular end of their compilation. For ſurely any young perſon who is to be admitted a member of an Oxford or Cambridge univerſity, and has been gradually inſtructed in the fundamental doctrines and principles of our eſtabliſhed church, muſt be ſuppoſed

to

to profeſs and believe the following propoſitions and matters of fact in equal conviction of judgment and ſteadineſs of faith as the moſt aged member of a lutheran conventicle. That there is but one living and true God, everlaſting, without body, parts, or paſſions, of infinite power, wiſdom, and goodneſs, the maker and preſerver of all things. That the doctrine of the trinity implieth three divine and diſtinct perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. The incarnation of Chriſt, his crucifixion, reſurrection, and aſcenſion. Now this propoſition and theſe hiſtorical matters of fact determine a man to be at heiſt and a chriſtian. And as a proteſtant chriſtian, in oppoſition to a papiſt, it is almoſt impoſſible but that the youngeſt member of a Cambridge or Oxford univerſity muſt know, believe, and be fully ſatisfied in his mind, that there are but two ſacraments, commonly called Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper. That the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation, purgatory, and the worſhipping of ſaints and images, are contrary both to reaſon and ſcripture; and that the Pope does not nor ought to exerciſe any civil or eccleſiaſtical authority in this realm. Theſe things clearly aſcertain the faith of a theiſt, a chriſtian, and a proteſtant chriſtian, and conſtitute

conſtitute the particular end for which the thirty-nine articles were compiled. And though an Halifax, Price, Prieſtly, or any other puritan does inſiſt upon it (and they have my leave to dwell upon it as long as they pleaſe), that theſe are matters of profound argument, of a mixed nature, hiſtorical, theological, and metaphyſical; yet I alſo inſiſt upon it, and have equal right to do ſo, that they are things which any young gentleman upon his initiation into our eſtabliſhed ſchools of philoſophy is ſuppoſed to know, believe, and to be fully ſatisfied of, not only upon the authority of learned and judicious divines, but alſo upon the authority of his own underſtanding and judgment. We allow indeed that the judgment of eighteen is not equal to that of forty, yet ſtill, ſince an aſſent is not required of them to any propoſitions or matters of fact which they have any reaſon to diſbelieve, their peace of mind muſt be undiſturbed, and of conſequence the objections of diſſention are a mere nullity. And I ſhall conclude with the following animadverſions on the unlogical and unphiloſophic method of arguing againſt the reaſonableneſs of a ſubſcription to the fundamental doctrines and religious ceremonies of our eſtabliſhed church, which

method

method of arguing is evidently held out in that kind of ſneering and raillery which is thrown out by the author of the Confeſſional, by Price, Prieſtly, and by diſſenters in general, on creeds, formularies, litanies and liturgies, ſyſtems, canons and articles. Now what hath the words *Credo* or *Credenda*, from whence the word *Creed* is derived, done to this choleric gentry, that it ſhould be made an object of contempt and ridicule? But this is ſomething, which, with other adopted methods of ſupporting a bad cauſe, is equally ſtrange and unaccountable. When I am called upon in obedience to the legiſlative authority of this realm to make a confeſſion of my faith in the following words of the Apoſtles Creed, *I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and in Jeſus Chriſt his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, born of the Virgin Mary, ſuffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried*;---In thus expreſſing my faith in God and in his Son Jeſus Chriſt, my mind is both pleaſed and edified; But notwithſtanding every puritan diſſenter condemns it as unreaſonable and unſcriptural, and is ready to aſſert that an introduction of it into their religious meeting-houſes would unhallow its congregated members, and even the ground

upon which they ſtand. And it ſhould be an alarming circumſtance to the moſt ſerious part of our lutheran and calviniſtic diſſenters, that (allowing the poſſibility of ſuch a thing) an honeſt atheiſt might, for the ſake of ſaving appearances, frequent their religious aſſemblies without being called upon to ſay any thing inconſiſtent with the notions of an atheiſtical infidelity. But if a man of this unhappy turn ſhould go upon a ſabbath-day to any of our eſtabliſhed churches, if he ſhould refuſe to join with the congregation, when every individual is called upon to ſay, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*, or, *O God the father of heaven have mercy upon us miſerable ſinners*, or, *Good Lord deliver us, We beſeech thee to hear us good Lord, Incline our hearts to keep this law, Lord have mercy upon us, Chriſt have mercy upon us, Lord have mercy upon us*; in all theſe inſtances if a perſon ſhould refuſe to make a perſonal acknowledgment of his faith in God and in Chriſt, it would give a juſt ſuſpicion of ſomething, which as a prudent man he muſt chooſe to avoid.

Secondly. We have indeed a printed and a legiſlated formulary of public worſhip, but becauſe the mode of public worſhip amongſt diſſenters has no exiſtence but in the

the heads and pockets of a few religious declaimers, and of conſequence is excluded from a public examination, therefore it muſt be moſt perfect and excellent of its kind; it being an allowed truth, that the extempore effuſions of a Price or a Prieſtley carry greater marks of judgment than any ſtudied or contemplated part of their compoſitions. But ſurely this is a method of arguing which from men of abilities and free inquiry, cannot be ſuppoſed to receive any approvement or recommendation.

Thirdly. Here it may be pertinently aſked, why are puritans offended at the greek words λιτανειω, λιτανεια, λίτυργιω, λιτυργια, or with the phraſe λιτεργος θεω, from whence the words *litany* and *liturgy* are derived. The world, indeed, has been favoured with a liturgy for Jews, Turks, Heathens, and Chriſtians; the author of it taking it for granted, in his undiſtinguiſhing lumber-houſe of a true and a falſe religion, that there can be no difference between the God of an idolater and a chriſtian. In a book publiſhed by a divine of no church, and highly extolled by the monthly reviewers, we have this remarkable and inſolent evomition: "Perpetual repetitions of the liturgy of the Church of England, which ſerve only to

ſate and tire the prieſt, and harraſs the deity." But give me leave to obſerve here from what I have experienced even at the Old Jewry, that there is amongſt the beſt calviniſtical orators one long, dull, continued, or concatenated ſameneſs of ſentiment and phraſeology, which is enough to nauſeate a ſenſible man, to diſguſt an angel, and to offend a God. Though I do not give this for logical conviction; but ſurely I have the ſame right juſtly and truly to condemn the religious proceedings of a conventicle, as the Zuinglians have inſolently to reprobate thoſe of an eſtabliſhment.

Fourthly. It is amazing, and indeed the practice of our diſſidents in matters of religion is a prodigious amazement, that by the author of the Confeſſional, by Price and Prieſtley, no words are ſo frequently made the objects of ſneer and raillery, as the words *ſyſtem*, *ſyſtematical*, *ſyſtematically*, *polity*, and *political*. But we will not impute this abſurd practice to a want of underſtanding the greek words συνιϛαμαι, πολις and πολιτικος, but rather to the prejudices of education. Nor, one might think, could it be neceſſary to inform this ſelf-confident gentry who pretend to ſtand in need of no information

information, and that all their knowledge in matters of religion is derived from a fountain more than human, that the Deity is the beſt politician in the univerſe: That he made and governs the world by certain rules of wiſdom or polity: That he is political in all his deſigns, and alſo politically right: That the ſolar and lunar ſyſtems hold out to us not only a profuſion of goodneſs, but of wiſdom or polity: That the moſt approved of all human compoſitions, even in matters of religion, are theſe which are ſyſtematically contrived and executed: And that every production which is ſent into the literary world without a ſyſtem, may be juſtly pronounced a nothing or a chaos: That every verſe or chapter in the New Teſtament is a ſyſtem, and that both Chriſt and his Apoſtles, in circumſtances of perſecution, made uſe of the beſt rules of human and divine polity for the moſt ſucceſsful propagation of the goſpel religion.

Fifthly. Concerning canons and articles: We, members of the Church of England, profeſs to be directed by certain revealed canons or rules of faith, having no reaſon to envy our opponents who chooſe to walk by the mere glimmering lights of extempore

pore effuſion. Concerning the thirty-nine articles: The monthly reviewers, men of renown for a ſublime profundity of genius and reconditeneſs of erudition, ſince they had not intereſt enough to ſuperſede a ſubſcription, have wiſely reſolved that an attempt to do ſomething muſt be continued by the efforts of genteel ſneer, and by the ſlow working influences of oratorical raillery; and being unexpectedly and graciouſly ſupported by a petitioning clergy, matters are ſo contrived, that the number 39 is doomed to be one of the moſt laughable things which preſbytery, in all confined company and converſation, can introduce; but however, to their no ſmall mortification, this number hath loſt nothing of its real value in any numerical or aſtronomical tables in Europe; no, nor have the thirty-nine articles loſt any thing of their intrinſic value, as conſonant both to reaſon and ſcripture. The articles, as it has been already obſerved, were intended to define a chriſtianly theiſtical, a purely chriſtian, and a proteſtant chriſtian character; and how any one who thinks it an amiable one, and would chooſe to be comprehended under its protection, can refuſe to ſubſcribe, or petition to be exempted from ſubſcribing to thoſe with which it is immediately

mediately connected, without juſtly incurring the imputation of ſomething which is odiousin itſelf and injurious to ſociety, is a point which a petitioning clergyman only is called upon to explain‡. In all ſocieties, it is evident to common ſenſe, that if the number

‡ In a book, publiſhed by a divine of no church, we have this extraordinary aſſertion, and it is ſanctioned by the judgment of a monthly reviewer, "That all articles, homilies and ſubſcription teſts, are merely the invention of ſuperſtition." It is the common but ſtrange practice of our adverſaries to prove the demonſtrable parts of the controverſy by mere poſitive aſſertions: If they would uſe a maſterly or architectonic manner of argumentation, they ſhould firſt of all define ſuperſtition, and then ſhew, that the ſeveral propoſitions and doctrines of the articles and homilies are agreeable to it; and this would be doing buſineſs which would give them ſome pretenſions to a mathematical, logical, and philoſophic reaſoner; but no ſuch reaſoning attempt has been made: However, ſince the articles and homilies are charged with being merely the invention of ſuperſtition, let us aſk our monthly writing genius if this deſcription of chriſtian theiſm, in oppoſition to that of idolatry, muſt be pronounced a mere fable, and an evident ſuperſtitious falſehood; that there is one living and true God, the maker and preſerver of all things both viſible and inviſible. I have too much charity to ſuppoſe, that theſe learned and pious men can be ſuppoſed to throw a propoſition of this nature into the lumber-houſe of ſuperſtition; and this propoſition was evidently intended for a definition of chriſtian theiſm. Nor can they be diſpoſed to call Chriſt's incarnation, crucifixion, reſurrection, and aſcenſion, mere fanciful conjectures, but to receive them as ſcriptural and hiſtorical matters of fact, an aſſent to which is neceſſary to the faith of a chriſtian. Nor can theſe gentlemen be eaſily inclined to report, that to pronounce the Romiſh doctrine, concerning purgatory, pardons, worſhipping

number of their articles, rules or ordinances to be obſerved, is a conſiderable one, ſome will be found more eſſential to their being and

ping and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and alſo invocation of ſaints, is a fond thing, vainly invented and grounded upon no warrantry of ſcripture, but rather repugnant to the will of God, muſt neceſſarily wound the conſcience of a calviniſtical diſſenter. Nor can theſe pretended reformiſts conſcientiouſly affirm, that to deny the Biſhop of Rome's juriſdiction in this realm of England, can ſuperſede the judgment of a reviewing diſſident: Neither, if we conſult the Homilies, ſince they were written with a deſign to ſhew the neceſſity of good works to ſalvation, to expoſe the injuries done to ſociety by gluttony and drunkenneſs, by idleneſs and rebellion; and ſince alſo the author of the Confeſſional allows that they were written with a manifeſt deſign to exhibit the ſuperſtitions and falſe doctrines of popery, ſurely they cannot juſtly be eſteemed the mere productions of ſuperſtitious invention: And ſo much in anſwer to an undemonſtrating divine of no church; and when I ſhall hear of his converſion to our eſtabliſhed church, there will be ſome hopes of his being qualified, in ſome diſtant æra of futurity, to be an attendant upon an Hooker or a Stanhope.

Secondly. Let us attend to a peremptory declaration of the famous Dr. Price, in oppoſition to the eſtabliſhed Church of England: Wiſely, ſays the Doctor, religious liberty is deſtroyed by human authority in religion, requiring conformity to modes of faith and worſhip, and ſuperſeding private judgment. This alſo is one of the mere efforts of declamatory aſſertions; nor will the Doctor affirm, that the particular propoſitions which I have juſt quoted, and have an immediate connection with the character of a chriſtian theiſt, of a chriſtian, and of a proteſtant chriſtian, do actually ſuperſede his conſcience, and contradict his judgment. A declaration of this kind he hath never yet made, and perhaps he hath too much prudence ever to do ſo; and I think he is abundantly more ſucceſsful in the buſineſs of enthu-

ſiaſtic

and character than others; though all may be neceſſarily conſidered as parts of one complicated ſyſtem. So that when the reli-

 gious

ſiaſtic rhapſody than in the province of an honeſt and ſound logician; nor would he have made an unreſpectable figure as a prime miniſter, or ſecretary of ſtate, in the tumultuous days and under the tyrannical protection of a Cromwellian government, which has no name in any language, either antient or modern.

Thirdly. The adverſaries of the Church of England have never had underſtanding to diſcover, nor honeſty enough to acknowledge, that the articles were compiled with a particular deſign to ſettle the nature of chriſtian theiſm, in oppoſition to that of idolatry, the fundamental articles of a chriſtian faith, and to aſcertain the particular and unſcriptural doctrines of the Church of Rome, as the true reaſon of our ſeparating from a communion with it.

Fourthly. The articles were deſigned as a certain rule of faith to every one who ſhould be admitted into the miniſtry of our eſtabliſhed church, that he might be clearly informed what doctrines he ſhould not preach without ſubjecting himſelf to the cenſure of epiſcopal authority.

Fifthly. To exclude all atheiſts, deiſts, arians, and papiſts, from the miniſtry of our eſtabliſhed church, in whatever honeſty or abilities they ſhall exiſt, by requiring a ſubſcription to ſuch articles as no honeſt man in either of theſe characters can be ſuppoſed to ſubſcribe.

Sixthly. I ſhall here obſerve, that though Chriſt and his Apoſtles had no legiſlative authority by which their goſpel religion could be ſanctioned, it cannot from hence be juſtly concluded, that it muſt be repugnant to the mind of God or of Chriſt that chriſtian kings and emperors ſhould not ſanction and eſtabliſh, by their legiſlative authority, the fundamental doctrines of the goſpel religion; and that the moſt pious, learned, and judicious divines, ſhould be employed (the gifts of inſpiration being withdrawn) to compoſe the beſt modes of worſhip which human wiſdom can ſuggeſt, and that ſuch modes of worſhip ſhould be perpetually continued, as ſhall be judged moſt perfect and acceptable.

gious articles or fortifications which were compiled and erected by our proteſtant and reforming anceſtors, with a wiſe deſign to defend the goſpel religion, the religion of God and of his heaven, from any open aſſaults of atheiſm, deiſm, and popery, ſhall be ſuperſeded or deſtroyed, then we may expect a junction with the corps of lutheran and calviniſtical diſciples.

The learned Mr. Jortin, in his preface to Remarks on Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, has honoured the moſt literate or ſcientific part of diſſenters, ſuch as a Taylor, Abernethy, Chandler, and a Forſter, with this latin compliment, *Cum tales ſint, utinam eſſent noſtri*; but the important and ſincere duty which I owe to the preſervation of the eccleſiaſtical and civil eſtabliſhments of my country, obligeth me thus to invert the compliment, and no doubt but it will be eſteemed highly uncomplaiſant by the whole fraternity of ſeperatiſts,--- *Cum tales ſint, gaudeo non eſſe noſtros.*

AN APPENDIX.

AN

APPENDIX.

SINCE it is the plain ſenſe and language of Scripture, and is the popular and orthodox doctrine of the Church of England, that the ſoul is in nature immortal and immaterial; and ſince many uſeleſs or unprofitable inquiries have been circulated, and are now circulating in the world by men of reputed genius and ability, to the no ſmall prejudice of religion and ſcience; in which inquiries it has been, and is now, attempted to prove an univerſal materialiſm, or to prove that there is no ſuch thing as Angel or Spirit, no difference between material and ſpiritual natures, and that the heavy lead and the light feather, by a few grains of ſome particularly refined organization, and by a few drachms of attraction, may become equally percipient and philoſophical as an Hartley, a Locke, or a Prieſtley: --- On the opinions of theſe three learned men, as relative to this point, I ſhall make the following obſervations.

CHAPTER I.

AS to the late learned and ingenious Mr. Hartley, whoſe abilities were an honour to himſelf, and a credit to his family, he had unfortunately travelled ſo long in the bye roads of a free inquiry into the nature and end of man, until he had entirely loſt ſight of the ſpiritual, immaterial, and immortal part of his humanity: So that, *je ne ſçai quoi*, it came into his head, that a combination of vibrating nerves, extended from the inferior parts of the eye to the beginning or to the middle of the brain, will account for the wonderful and glorious works, effects and conſequences, which are commonly aſcribed to an intelligent and active ſpirit. But let me here obſerve, that if this combination of nerves could be ſuppoſed to perform ten thouſand vibrations in a ſecond, yet ſtill theſe nerves muſt be material, and can claim no more ſimilitude to the properties of a ſpiritual nature, than the ſtagnated fluids of a dead body, to the circulating ones of that which is alive

Secondly.

Secondly. Mr. Prieſtley having puſhed forward his free enquiries into particular modes of exiſtence, and of the operation of bodies in and upon one another, not content with diſcovering the effects which do naturally ariſe from ſuch modes of exiſtence and operation, and in which we are only concerned in the preſent ſtate of human nature, pretends to have made this moſt uſeful and important diſcovery, That our whole human nature is omogeneous; and thus as a ſound logician he proceedeth to argue: It is allowed by the whole fraternity of experimentaliſts, that one part of human nature is a material body, nature, eſſence, or ſubſtance, for we muſt make uſe only of ſuch words as language will afford, that this material body is unintelligent, inactive, unſelf-directing, and unſelf-moving, liable to corruption and putrefaction, like the potter's veſſel, or the ſcavenger's cart; but, ſays Mr. Prieſtly, the intelligent, active, ſelf-directing, and ſelf-moving part of us, is omogeneous with the body, and therefore muſt be purely material. And indeed, allowing Mr. Prieſtly his premiſes, that our whole humanity is material, the conſequence is juſt, but the object of his demonſtrable propoſition, that our whole humanity is omogeneous, is converted into

a datum, and the truth of his propoſition is proved in a corollary to be derived from this datum; a method of reaſoning, or of drawing corollaries from data's, inſtead of demonſtrated propoſitions, which an Euclid or a Plato would have heartily laughed at and deſpiſed. And whenever Mr. Prieſtley in an uncommon courſe of experiments ſhall have diſcovered in the natural world, or ſhall be able to make a glaſs, a bottle, table, or chair, to think and write inſtitutes to ſelf-direct and ſelf-move, taking up this glaſs or bottle body, and, as a man is able to do with his, to carry it about from place to place, and from one end of the globe to the other, without the help of a pulley, a lever, or any of the mechanical powers; this, and nothing leſs than this, can ſatisfactorily prove the poſſibility and the reality of an intelligent, active, ſelf-directing and ſelf-moving body of matter, which is liable to waſte, decay, and corruption, like this to which our godlike and thinking part of humanity is united. For if the moſt knowing experimentaliſt ſhould tell the firſt rational cobler which he meets with, that he was all body, and had no ſoul or ſpirit united to it, which, without any miraculous interpoſition of omnipotence, would ſurvive this body, upon a ſeparation from

from it, this cobler might be diſpoſed to ſay, Maſter, you are a learned man, and a fine ſcholar; but ſtrictly adhering to the dictates of common ſenſe and reaſon, as he ought to do, the cobler would pay no more regard to the truth of our experimentaliſt's doctrine, than is due to the dreams of an ideot, or the reveries of a madman. And ſince Prieſtley, Hartley, and our modern materialiſts, are little better than plagiary retailers of Mr. Locke's miſtaken notions of the poſſibility of a thinking and material body, I ſhall briefly conſider what he has advanced upon this ſubject,--- *Humanum enim eſt errare.* In that part of Mr. Locke's eſſay on the human underſtanding, in which his ſentiments on this ſubject are conſpicuouſly delivered, I find no juſt reaſon to place Mr. Locke amongſt our free-thinking materialiſts, either ancient or modern. Mr. Locke ſays, that ſome (without mentioning any perſons names, or the age and country in which they lived) have declared, that the human ſoul or mind is nothing but the ſubtileſt parts of matter: But that ſuch an opinion was an article of his own creed, he hath not given us the leaſt reaſon to believe, or aſſert.

The

The ſtate of the queſtion ſtands briefly thus: It has been conſtantly maintained by the orthodox learned and unlearned part of mankind, in all civilized ages of the world, that the ſouls of men, being once furniſhed with ideas, or the common materials of thinking, are continually employed, even whilſt a man is in a ſtate of ſleep in this buſineſs of thought or contemplation. But Mr Locke hath eſpouſed the oppoſite ſide of the queſtion, and he ſhall ſpeak for himſelf in the following words: I grant that the ſoul in a waking man is never without thought, becauſe it is the condition of being awake; but whether ſleeping, without dreaming, be not an affection of the whole man, mind, as well as body, may be worth a waking man's conſideration.---As for my own part I do not think the point in queſtion to be of ſufficient conſequence to individuals, or to ſociety at large, as to be worth a waking man's conſideration; and am rather ſurprized, that a man of Mr. Locke's underſtanding and judgment ſhould ever ſeriouſly have thought to attempt a determination. Mr Locke's ſelf-evident reaſon, in ſupport of his opinion, is this, If the mind or ſoul does really think, whilſt a man is aſleep, ſhe muſt be conſcious of doing ſo, and if at that

that time ſhe hath a conſciouſneſs of it, upon a man's waking, the mind would be able to recollect the particular objects of her ſpeculation; but ſuch a recollection ſhe is not always able to produce, and therefore, in natural conſequence of this matter of fact, he concludes, that men do not always think. I ſhall not at preſent offer any reaſons to confute the unlogical impotency of this concluſion, for my chief buſineſs at preſent is with our modern materialiſts. The grand objection with theſe free-thinking and free-enquiring gentlemen, againſt the ſpirituality of what we good chriſtians commonly call the ſoul or mind of man, is, that if a ſpiritual nature is united to our bodily frame, how comes it to paſs that ſhe ſhould exiſt in an unintelligent ſtate, as ſhe evidently does, whilſt united to a fœtus in the womb. Let me tell theſe gentlemen what perhaps they have never attentively conſidered, that, taking for granted what is commonly believed, there are an infinite number of ſpirits, or of ſpiritual beings, whom we call angels and archangels, I would obſerve, that each of theſe, in their firſt moment of exiſtence or creation, muſt have been equally unintelligent as a fœtus in the womb, but that infinite power and wiſdom might place

 them

them in a ſituation in which they may be capable of acquiring more knowledge, relative to their own being, and to that of things and creatures around them, in one day, than a Newton could poſſibly attain to, during the whole period of his life. From hence I conclude, that the eſſential difference between material and ſpiritual natures, is this, that ſpiritual natures have a perpetual capacity of becoming intelligent, ſelf-directing, and ſelf-moving, which capacity does not, and cannot belong to the other; nor do I know that Mr. Prieſtley, in the whole courſe of his experiments, has ever diſcovered ſuch a capacity in any material body, which has ever fallen under the boilings and roaſtings of his chymical machinery. Another objection againſt the ſpirituality of the ſoul, is, that 'tis impoſſible for omnipotence to unite a ſpiritual nature to a material one, ſo that body can be made an inſtrument of raiſing up in a ſpirit ſuch a ſtock of ideas as will furniſh perpetual matter of thought and contemplation: But what authority from reaſon or revelation have theſe gentlemen for ſaying that no ſuch union between a material and ſpiritual nature can poſſibly exiſt; my anſwer only to ſuch an objection is, that we are fearfully and wonderfully made,

and

and that my ſoul knoweth right well; nor ſhall I blaſphemouſly attempt to circumſcribe the powers of omnipotence. And I ſhall briefly conclude my ſentiments upon this point, in what I think may be called and allowed to be demonſtration. The foundation points of my demonſtration, to be taken from the reaſon and nature of things, and from the Holy Scriptures, are theſe.

Firſt. In matters of mathematical ſcience whatever properties ſhall be found in any material body, which define it to be of a triangular nature, muſt be a triangle; and that whatever properties are obſerved which define a material body to have the nature of a circle, muſt be a circle.

Secondly. There are but two different and contrary natures in the univerſe, matter and ſpirit, or material and ſpiritual. That we can have no idea of material and ſpiritual bodies, ſubſtances, natures, or eſſences; and that we can only know that ſuch different and contrary natures do exiſt from the different and contrary properties which are evidenced by fact and experience; and that the properties of one nature cannot poſſibly exiſt in that of a

contrary one. Theſe things being granted, the demonſtration will ſtand thus:

We are aſſured from the Holy Scriptures, and from the univerſal conſent of chriſtians (a few materialiſts excepted), that God is a ſpirit, or that his divine nature is purely ſpiritual, and contrary to that of matter: And it will be readily granted, that the properties of this ſpirit, from fact and experience, are a ſelf-directing will and power, a perception of an infinite variety of certain rules of polity or wiſdom, of goodneſs and juſtice, by an immutable adherence to which he preſerves in the minds of all his created rationals the character of an infinitely juſt and good governor. And I find alſo, by fact and experience in the nature of man, a ſelf-directing will and power, a perception of certain rules of polity or wiſdom, of goodneſs and juſtice, by an adherence to which he preſents to himſelf and to his fellow rationals the character of a good and juſt man: Nor is any degree of ſenſe, ſuperior to that of common ſenſe, neceſſary to draw this concluſion, That one part of our humanity muſt be a ſpirit, or a ſpiritual nature. And this kind of demonſtration is to be ſeen in the two particular compoſitions of the divine Plato, called his

his Phædo and his Legibus. And I think that I may ſay with Mr. Addiſon, "Plato, thou reaſoneſt well."

If a materialiſt ſhall preſume to aſk once more, How can body and ſpirit be ſo united, that a ſelf-directing, ſelf-moving and active ſpirit can perpetually direct and govern the inactive and unintelligent body; or how can this compound nature of body and ſpirit produce other compound natures in the common way of generation, as it is undeniably proved from fact and experience? I anſwer, as I have done before, that we are fearfully and wonderfully made, and that my ſoul knoweth right well.

To ſupport the dignity of my rational nature I have been induced to make the above reflections and animadverſions, being better pleaſed with thinking that I am related to the divine nature of God, and of his holy angels, than that my neareſt relation muſt be a dead cuſtard, or an unintelligent trifle.---- I ſhall write nothing more at preſent on the impoſſibility of thinking matter, becauſe on this ſubject there is a deſign to communicate to the public the opinion and arguments of the

two

two great geniuſſes of Plato and Tully, for the entertainment of the divine and the philoſopher.

CHAPTER II.

OF all the free enquiries which have been ſent forth into the literary world, none has a more direct and natural tendency, to ſuperſede the important duty of public worſhip and private devotion, than a free enquiry into the origin of natural and moral evil. It might, indeed, be more properly called an univerſal ſyſtem of miſotheiſm and miſanthropy; becauſe it is not eaſy to determine whether, in this extraordinary performance, a rational God, or his rational creature man, is moſt egregiouſly blaſphemed. The Deity himſelf is repreſented in the moſt piteous and deplorable condition, being obliged to behold his creatures oppreſſed with great evils, pain, and miſery, without being able to contribute

bute any thing to their relief; he is repreſented alſo as implanting bad diſpoſitions of every kind in the nature of his created rationals, by which they are neceſſitated to deal in impiety, prophaneneſs, lying, theft, murder, and in all wicked actions, which in a ſtate of ſociety they have opportunities to commit. And upon this account, I ſay, that this performance may be juſtly titled an univerſal ſyſtem of miſotheiſm.

Secondly. Though many wiſe, great, virtuous, and ſober men, ſtand upon the liſt of kings, lawgivers, and founders of empires, yet not one of this character is mentioned in any part of this enquiring compoſition. The clergy are reprobated with a deſign of erecting a government inconſiſtent with the liberties of mankind, and all great men at the head of ſtates and empires are repreſented as governing by tyranny, oppreſſion, and violence, ſo that both the clergy and laity are thrown into one common budget of miſanthropy; and, according to the particular mode in which the imperfections of human nature is repreſented, the ſhop of every tradeſman is the ſhop of a knave: But, though human nature is by woful experience very corrupt, yet I am inclined to think there is not ſo much

much wickedneſs in deſign and principle, as in this enquiry has been uncharitably delineated.

Thirdly. The reaſon of the author of this enquiry's falling into frequent errors, miſtakes, and blunders, into myſteries, difficulties, and ambiguities, is owing to his having ſent a pretended demonſtration into the world without any definitions or axioms. For when I look into Euclid I find that he hath laid down thirty-five definitions and twelve axioms, which are to be admitted under the denomination of ſelf-evident propoſitions: It being the buſineſs of demonſtration to ſhew, that ſome ſeparate and diſtinct propoſitions are agreeable to one or other of thoſe which are allowed to be ſelf-evident, and that all corollaries which are and may be drawn from a ſelf-evident or demonſtrated propoſition muſt be allowed a place in the treaſure-houſe of truth.

For want therefore of definitions or axioms, I find the author of this enquiry frequently attempting to demonſtrate a ſelf-evident propoſition, and to deny that which is ſo; upon which account he is every where confounding his own underſtanding,

ſtanding, and throwing that of his readers into all the confuſions of perplexity.

Fourthly. The erroneouſneſs and inefficiency of this performance originally and immediately proceeded from a pride to contradict that account of the origin of natural good and evil, which has been given by learned divines and judicious moraliſts, and a want of clearly underſtanding and attending to the firſt principles upon which their demonſtrable ſuperſtructure has been raiſed.

Fifthly. From the following declarations I believe the author of this enquiry would be glad, if it was poſſible, to have it baniſhed from the literary world; becauſe it does infinite diſcredit to his pretended virtue, whatever it may be to his abilities.

Sixthly. It is neceſſary to obſerve, that the author of this enquiry is one of our phyſical or philoſophical neceſſity gentlemen, who are perpetually making uſe of terms which they have never defined, and to which they have no clear or ſettled idea; upon which account, in the uſe of theſe terms, they are conſtantly making their own mind a chaos, and that of their readers as conſtant a myſtery.

The author of this enquiry has lately made the following frank and ingenious declarations : -----

Far be it from me to intend, by any thing which I have ſaid or ſhall ſay, to make God the author of evil in the ſenſe which Philaretus ſuppoſes to follow from the doctrine of neceſſity; I deteſt the idea: And if any of my poſitions imply it, I do declare it was not intended by me. I have conſidered the principal objections to the doctrine of philoſophical neceſſity, and if my arguments are not juſt, I wiſh they may be clearly confuted; for my mind is open to information.

If, ſays he, in proof of this doctrine of neceſſity, infinite wiſdom, power, and goodneſs, could have prevented evil, he could not have wanted a will to prevent it. ---Evil, as evil, cannot be the choice of any being: What effect the doctrine of philoſophical neceſſity, if it were univerſally received, would produce amongſt mankind, Philaretus nor Philalathes can divine.

I ſhall therefore proceed to mention certain definitions and axioms which have been laid down by learned divines and judicious

judicious moraliſts, with a deſign to ſolve difficulties of this nature, to account for the introduction of natural and for the practice of moral evil, as conſiſtent with the moral attributes of divine goodneſs and juſtice, or with the moral characters of a good parent and a juſt governor; and then I ſhall examine ſuch other definitions and axioms as are made uſe of by the author of this enquiry with a deſign alſo to vindicate the proceedings of a divine œconomy; leaving the moſt ſenſible and judicious part of mankind to determine which of the two have the beſt pretenſions to the truth of common ſenſe, and of conſequence are moſt ſatisfactory.

Firſt. It is taken for granted, by learned divines and judicious moraliſts, that the Deity muſt have always continued the ſole inhabitant of an immenſe univerſe, without a creation of worlds, and of ſuch rational, ſelf-moving, ſelf-directing, and ſelf-governing creatures, to which we give the names of mere animals, men, and angels.

Secondly. Antecedent to the date of creation, the relation or character of a parent and governor could have no exiſtence.

Thirdly. All created, rational, intelligent, ſelf-moving and ſelf-directing beings, muſt exiſt in the relation of children and ſubjects of the univerſal family and government of God.

Fourthly. Ideas of things, of ends to be propoſed, of means neceſſary to obtain them, of actions which we call good and bad, right and wrong, uſeful or injurious, agreeable or contrary to the will and laws of God's ſupreme government, muſt exiſt as rules of action in the mind of every ſelf-moving, ſelf-directing, and ſelf-governing rational.

Fifthly. It is the condition of every man or rational to be at liberty to do right or wrong, or to act up to the character of dutiful and diſobedient ſubjects of God's ſupreme government, in the preſent or in any future ſtate of exiſtence.

Sixthly. The end of creation is the ſame with the end of government.

Seventhly. The end of creation or government entirely terminates in the fixed reſolution of a parent to put every rational creature, child, or ſubject, in a condition to make himſelf happy or miſerable.

Eighthly.

Eighthly. That every rational or free agent muſt be the immediate cauſe of his own happineſs, it being the condition* of a rational or free-agent to be ſo.

Ninthly. Whenever created rationals, as creatures, children, and ſubjects of government, knowingly offend againſt the will, or violate the laws of God, and of conſequence offer inſult and indignity to his perſon and government, they muſt be blameable in the judgment of their own minds and in that of God, and of conſequence become objects of puniſhment.

Tenthly. That God foreſeeing, before a creation of the world, the moral ſtate of his rational creatures, created and fitted up a world, if I may ſo ſay, for the habitation of ſinners and rebels, by ſo organizing their bodies to which their ſpiritual natures are united, that they ſhould be liable to the evils or puniſhment of agues, fevers, broken limbs, of plagues, famine and peſtilence, of earthquakes, thunderings and lightenings,

* When Mr. Locke ſays, it is the condition of a waking man to think, he means, that every waking man is under a neceſſity of thinking. And in Mr. Locke's ſenſe I uſe this phraſe; it is, or it being the condition.

ings, and of various other evils, which it is unneceſſary to mention.

Eleventhly. That theſe natural and unavoidable evils were intended and have a natural tendency to bring ſinners and rebels to a ſtate of ſerious thinking, of repentance, of acknowledging their unworthineſs, ingratitude, and ſins, of praying to be delivered from preſent and to be exempted from future puniſhment, and that another trial may be made of their fidelity and allegiance? And indeed God has graciouſly promiſed by the mouth of his holy prophets and meſſengers under the law and the goſpel, that through the merits of Chriſt's ſacrifice of himſelf on the croſs, and through the bleſſed effects of his mediation under a new covenant, that another trial ſhall be made of their fidelity and allegiance, and that ſincerely repenting ſinners and rebels ſhall be happy hereafter, ſo far as his free pardon and an exemption from all extraneous puniſhment can make them ſo. In theſe poſitions of learned divines and judicious moraliſts we have an account for the introduction of natural, and for the practice of moral evil, which, in my opinion, to any ſenſible man, under the directions of common ſenſe, muſt appear unobjectionable.

unobjectionable. And I ſhall now proceed to examine other definitions or axioms which have been laid down by the author of this free enquiry as a foundation from which a vindication alſo of a divine œconomy is to be raiſed.

Firſt. He takes it for granted, or lays it down as an axiom, that the end of creation muſt center in a communication of happineſs: And he is running this from the beginning to the end of his enquiry as a puzzlecap queſtion, how therefore comes it to paſs, that there ſhould be in the world ſo much unhappineſs and miſery, of which every day's experience is an undeniable teſtimony? But this axiom of his, that the end of creation is ſome direct, poſitive, and immediate communication of happineſs, is a falſe one; becauſe the end of creation, with reſpect to men and to all created rationals, muſt be the end of government; but the end of government, and of conſequence the end of creation, is to place men, or any created rationals, in a condition, in which they ſhall have opportunities, or ſhall have it in their power, to make themſelves happy or miſerable; which is a very different, and even a contrary propoſition.---It is very ſtrange, that the

the author of this free enquiry could never recollect, or meet with any ſenſible man who could have given him an eaſy and ſatisfactory information, that it is the condition of men and of all created rationals or free-agents, from ideas of things and actions, which are evidently right and wrong, good and evil, contrary or agreeable to the will of God, and from a conſciouſneſs of exiſting in the relation of ſubjects of God's univerſal family or government, to be the immediate cauſes of their own happineſs or miſery.

For inſtance: To the happineſs of ſuch embodied rationals as men are, to eat, drink, ſleep, and to be cloathed, is abſolutely neceſſary; but can any man in his ſenſes ſay, that the Deity eats, drinks, ſleeps, and weareth cloaths for his creatures, or that he is the immediate cauſe of their doing ſo, in all ſuch caſes and circumſtances of action.

It is evident again, that any man may make uſe of a knife, a razor, or a ſword, by ſo hurting and cutting his own fleſh, as to make himſelf very miſerable; and in ſimilar ways of action he may make himſelf inſtrumental to the miſery of other fellow-creatures:

creatures: Nor to be the cauſe of miſery to himſelf, and to other fellow-ſubjects, is it any object of omnipotence to prevent. And from hence it may fairly be preſumed, that the two great but contrary ends of government, and conſequently of creation, are to reward or make happy, by confirmed acts of favour and love in the preſent, or in a future ſtate of exiſtence, good and obedient ſubjects; but to puniſh or make miſerable the lawleſs and diſobedient. So that when the author of this enquiry ſays, that the end of creation muſt be a communication of happineſs, of which in no caſe man is the immediate giver to himſelf, or that God is the immediate cauſe of all cauſes, the origin of all origins, and the immediate fountain of all fountains of happineſs and miſery to his creatures, is a propoſition which evidently contradicts all fact and experience, and every thing which we are ſuppoſed to know of ourſelves and of the condition of human nature.

Thirdly. Another axiom laid down by the author of this inquiry, and which will be found to be none of the matter of facts of human knowledge, nor to be any object of philoſophical inveſtigation, is this: That this world was made for the ſake of ſome

architectonic harmony, or as a neceſſary part of ſome univerſal and material ſyſtem, without which the whole would be unmeaning, motionleſs, and imperfect. So that if God had foreſeen that the embodied rationals of this world would have acted up to the character of perfectly dutiful ſubjects of his ſupreme government, they muſt have been liable to all the natural and unavoidable evils or puniſhments in which they are occaſionally and accidentally involved. From this whimſical account of things, how hard and piteous muſt be the condition of a good God, that he ſhould be under a neceſſity of creating a world in which a ſociety of innocent, thinking, and embodied ſpirits ſhould be expoſed to miſeries of which, in the character of innocents, they muſt be entirely undeſerving. But on the contrary, learned divines and judicious moraliſts affirm, that this world is ſome ſeparate, independent, and perfect piece of material architecture; that by certain rules of divine polity the powers of attraction and gravitation were given to the whole and to all its parts, that it was fitted up for the reception of embodied rationals or ſpirits in the character of ſinners and rebels, in ſuch a manner as to make them liable to a variety of evils or

puniſhments

puniſhments, which were graciouſly deſigned to bring them to a ſtate of ſincere repentance, to promiſes of a better obedience for the future, and of conſequence, through the merits of Chriſt, to give them the moſt comfortable expectations of another trial of their fidelity and allegiance. No doubt but the almighty architect of worlds had good reaſons, which I ſhall not blaſphemouſly attempt to analize, for dealing in number and variety. And we might with equal juſtice affirm, that any particular watch, which is of itſelf a diſtinct and perfect piece of mechaniſm, would be under an immediate neceſſity of having all its parts disjoined, and of becoming utterly uſeleſs, if all the other watches in the kingdom ſhould be annihilated, as to affirm, that this world of ours could not keep at the ſame diſtance from, nor turn round its centre of light and heat for anſwering all the great and wiſe purpoſes of our preſervation and ſubſiſtence, if it ſhould pleaſe the Almighty to annihilate the planets of Mercury or Saturn. But this doctrine of incoherent and unprophetic dreaming that this world was not formed upon any principles of moral polity, with a deſign to act in the lovely characters of a good parent and a juſt governor, and to be dealing out mea-

ſures of love and bounty, or of diſpleaſure and puniſhment, as his rational ſubjects then are found to deſerve, but that this world was made only as an appendix to ſome other ſyſtem, without any regard to the moral deſerts of his creatures: This neceſſity doctrine, I ſay, can give no merit to the author of this enquiry as its primary inveſtigator; becauſe it had been long before broached by Lord Bolingbroke to ſilence the remonſtrances of a bad conſcience, and by the learned Dr. King, Archbiſhop of Dublin, who was not aware of the bad conſequences of which, in point of piety and virtue, it is naturally productive. Nor can any thing be conceived more full of an abſurd pride, arrogance, and ſelf-ſufficiency, than to write ſo peremptorily of an almoſt immenſe ſyſtem, of which it is impoſſible that a creature, whoſe exiſtence is confined to a few yards, can be a competent judge, and eſpecially to make it the foundation of ſome demonſtrable ſuperſtructure.

Fourthly. Another axiom laid down by this neceſſity gentleman is, that we cannot judge of the diſpenſations of a creator to his creatures by the ſame rules which are applied to the dealings of men towards each other,

other, between which there is not the leaſt proportion or ſimilitude. Now this axiom is contrary to the whole doctrine of ſimilitude or analogy, which different but ſimilar things and natures are allowed to bear to one another. And this axiom of his may be ſaid to be a blunder of the firſt magnitude; and in the following manner I prove it to be ſo: Common ſenſe allows, that one ſphere, triangle, ſquare, or circle, do bear a proportion, ſimilitude, or analogy, to other different ſpheres, triangles, ſquares, and circles. Common ſenſe again allows, that God, angels, and men, are rational beings or natures; and for the ſame reaſon that one triangle is allowed to bear a proportion, ſimilitude, or analogy to another, ſo muſt alſo one rational nature bear a ſimilitude or analogy to another. And who can want ability to draw this conſequence, that therefore there muſt be a ſimilitude betwen the rational natures of God, Angels, and Men. It is evident, beyond a contradiction, that God, Angels, and Men, are wiſe, powerful, good, and juſt beings, and of conſequence that wiſdom, power, goodneſs, and juſtice, muſt be conſidered as things analogous to one another, as they exiſt in the different rational minds of God, Angels, and Men.

There

There can be no doubt but that the idea of a ſphere, triangle, cylinder, pyramid, cone, or circle, and of the proportion which the ſeveral parts of theſe figures bear to one another, as they exiſted in the mind of a Newton, muſt have a ſimilar exiſtence in the mind of God: Nor without ſuch ideas of differently modified parts of ſpace in the mind of God is it poſſible that the body of a man, a fiſh, or a fly, could be organized by any rules of polity, wiſdom, or deſign. Nothing can be more ſelf-evidently conſpicuous, but that all deſigns and actions which belong to a good and juſt character, whether applied to God or man, muſt be analogous to one another; for inſtance, a good earthly parent deſigns to, and actually does, provide meat, drink, and cloathes for his children; and a good heavenly parent deſigned to give, and in reality did give a fruitfulneſs to the earthly parts of this world, from whence the neceſſaries of preſervation and ſubſiſtence to his creatures are derived; and theſe deſigns and actions as applied to God and man muſt have a ſimilitude to each other. Many other obſervations of this kind might be made; but whoever is not clearly convinced from hence, that the diſpenſations of a creator to his creatures may

be

be rightly judged of by certain rules of goodneſs and juſtice, agreeable to which men do and ought to treat one another, may be pronounced better qualified to make caps for fools and rattles for children than to talk and write about analogous deſigns, actions, and arguments, as they exiſt in the different minds of a God, an Angel, or a man.

Fifthly. We have another important axiom, and a very extraordinary one it is indeed: That it is not in the power of God to prevent any evils which exiſt from a neceſſity, in the reaſon and nature of things. And when it has been proved that neceſſity ever was or can be the cauſe of any good or evil, this propoſition ſhall have my free leave to be allowed a corner in the treaſure-houſe of truth. But, at preſent, neceſſity is one of the moſt unthinking and uncauſing powers in the univerſe; being equally impotent as fate, chance, or an atheiſtical fortuitous concourſe of atoms. But ſince no neceſſity evils have been mentioned which it is not in the power of God to alleviate or remove, it is ſurely reaſonable to expect that the author of this enquiry, or his friends, ſhould be able to give a name to one or more

more of theſe formidable evils which are peremptorily declared to bid defiance to omnipotence itſelf: but no ſuch evils have been, nor can any ſuch be mentioned. And on the other ſide of the queſtion it has been uniformly declared by learned divines and judicious moraliſts,—*Firſt*, That, concerning natural and unavoidable evils to which the embodied ſpirits of men are providentially ſubject, a plague, famine, or peſtilence, a fiery furnace and hungry lions were unable to hurt or deſtroy, when it was the will of God to command the contrary. This is a matter of fact, confirmed by the authority of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Teſtament; and upon the ſimilar authority of the Holy Scriptures of the New Teſtament no womb-born impotency of ſight or of feet, no fever, ſtorm, or tempeſt, no degrees of madneſs or inſanity of any kind, could reſiſt the divine and omnipotent power of Chriſt.—*Secondly*, If we deſcend to the general and more ordinary operations of material nature, it has been affirmed by learned divines and judicious moraliſts, that the powers of gravitation, of attraction and repulſion, of the attraction of cohœſion and electricity, and which give birth to the ordinary evils of human life, by operating in and upon all organized

organized and unorganized material bodies, were originally impreſſed upon them by the almighty power of God, and may at any time be ſuſpended or deſtroyed by the ſame almighty power of God, from whence they originally proceeded.

In this view of certain definitions and axioms which belong to both ſides of the queſtion, as a foundation from whence is raiſed a ſimilar ſuperſtructure, which I call a vindication of a divine œconomy, conſiſtent with the moral characters of a good parent and a juſt governor, I ſhall conclude with the following animadverſions on ſuch doctrines of a philoſophical neceſſity as immediately relate to the nature and duties of religion, and to the end of creation and government.

Firſt. It is one of the principal doctrines of a philoſophical, or rather of an unphiloſophical and irreligious neceſſity, that a plague, famine, or a peſtilence, and all other natural evils to which we are liable, do exiſt from ſome neceſſity in the nature of things, and therefore are evils which even omnipotence itſelf cannot diſpenſe with, or prevent. The good people of England indeed, in my opinion, are no

leſs truly than piouſly directed to pray for a deliverance or exemption from the evils of a plague, a famine, and a peſtilence; but certain gentlemen, when they become philoſophically neceſſitous, claim a privilege of ſaying any thing, and therefore pronounce every religious addreſs of this nature to be the reſult of a groſs error, or of a palpable abſurdity. But if, in the language of Mr. Toplady, this neceſſitarian doctrine muſt be received for truth, it is evident to common ſenſe that, with regard to the providence of God, we have nothing to aſk, and nothing to fear; becauſe all events, relative to human happineſs and miſery, inſtead of being at the diſpoſal of an Almighty God, are the abſolute property of a feminine neceſſity. And in this view of things, if it is not in the power of God to remove evils from the pious and penitent, nor to throw evils upon the continuing refractory and diſobedient ſubjects of his univerſal family and government, here is a manifeſt nulling of the duties of public prayer and private devotion, and as manifeſt a deſtruction of the two great ends of government in occaſionally diſpenſing favour to the returning, but puniſhment to the impenitent ſinner. And to prove the abſurdity of this neceſſa-

rian

rian doctrine, which may juſtly be ſaid to have more wants than omnipotence itſelf can relieve, it may be affirmed with equal propriety, that the ſupreme civil magiſtrate of this realm has no power to ſuſpend or remit the puniſhment of death which a Judge ſhall pronounce upon a capital offender, as that the Deity cannot ſuſpend or annihilate, whenever he thinks fit, his own powers of action, impreſſed upon all material nature, which, in ſome particular mode of operation, might produce a plague, a famine, or a peſtilence. From hence I think we may preſume to determine upon this queſtion of our free enquirers, which he has declared to be profoundly dark and unfathomably myſterious, What effect, ſays he, the doctrine of a philoſophical neceſſity, if it were univerſally received, would produce amongſt mankind, Philaretus nor Philalathes, nor any other perſon, I may add, can divine.

Firſt. It is a fundamental doctrine of this ſtrange philoſophical neceſſity, that every natural good which men muſt chooſe to enjoy, and every evil which they would chooſe to avoid, do exiſt from a neceſſity in the reaſon and nature of things; and therefore it is not in the power of God to

confer the one or prevent the other in oppoſition to the neceſſary effects of ſome perpetually operating powers of nature. And if this doctrine ſhould be univerſally received it muſt evidently produce an univerſal and practical atheiſm, ſuperſeding all the duties of religion, or of public and private prayer: Becauſe it muſt be abſurd to pray to any being under the titles of a God, Lord, Maſter, Governor, or Superior, of any denomination, for favours, which men are fully ſatisfied it is not in his power to give. So that the Deity, in this caſe, is repreſented in a no more reſpectable light than is reflected from a mere dependent on ſomething, which the Greeks call φυσις, the Romans and the Engliſh *natura* and *nature*, which is ſuppoſed to be perpetually pregnant with a philoſophical neceſſity, equally ſuperior to the will and power of God, as the fates are ſuperſtitiouſly repreſented by the Roman poets to be unreſtrainable by the will and power of Jove. This free enquirer therefore very ignorantly or artfully declares, that no ſagacious man is able to divine what effect an univerſal belief of this doctrine would have upon the religious opinions and lives of men, when it is obvious to common ſenſe that if this doctrine ſhould be univerſally

verſally received, practical atheiſm muſt be its natural and inevitable production.

Secondly. On this poſition, which we will admit for ſome mathematical axiom, or ſtandard of truth, that evil as evil cannot be the choice of any being, is raiſed the following demonſtrable or ſuperſtructured propoſition, in proof, that every man is under a neceſſity of willing, chooſing, or determining to do every good or evil action of their lives, beyond any poſſibility of acting otherwiſe.

‡ "If a man cannot help judging according to the appearance of things, and cannot determine himſelf but by motives moſt agreeable to his diſpoſition or ſtate of mind, and it be not in his power to alter that ſtate or thoſe motives, does it not follow that this moral neceſſity, which is ſaid to be conſiſtent with liberty, is equal to a phyſical neceſſity? And that a man is no more blameable or commendable for determining himſelf to certain actions, than he is for the appearance of things, the agreeableneſs of motives, the vibrations of his

‡ From an attempt to obviate the principal objections made againſt the doctrine pf philoſophical neceſſity.

his brain*, the motion of his blood, or the flow of his animal ſpirits: For if a man determines himſelf by the moſt agreeable motives, he has not I think, properly ſpeaking, a liberty of contradiction or contrariety."

Now if this pretendedly demonſtrated propoſition muſt be admitted for truth, it is evident that whoever is conſcious of having undignified and inſulted his God by the impiety of prophane curſing and ſwearing, or hath done evil to his neighbour by theft, violence, or aſſaſſination, is no more blameable for ſuch actions than he is for the agreeableneſs of particular motives to them, for the vibrations of his brain, the motion of his blood, or the flow of his animal ſpirits. But any ſenſible man in the kingdom would inform this philoſophically neceſſitous gentleman that every one is blameable for the acts of theft or murder, that he deſerves to be puniſhed for them both at a human and divine

* I never before heard of a vibrating brain, though I will not undertake to anſwer for the odd brain of a philoſophical neceſſity, but ſince nerves and fibres may be compared to ſtrings, to talk or write of a vibrating nerve or fibre is common and warrantable by the ordinary facts of nature.

divine tribunal, becauſe he was at liberty to have acted otherwiſe. And I much doubt, if this gentleman could openly declare, that no man was blameable for theft or murder without ſome convulſive feelings of ſceptiſm and perplexity; but for want of definitions to guide the mind and direct the judgment he goes on, at all adventures, to declare, aſſert, and affirm away, without being ſenſible when, with regard to expreſſion, he falls into an impropriety, and when, with regard to terms, he begets a contradiction; for the eſtabliſhed laws of every civilized country declare a man both puniſhable and blameable for committing theft or murder, but they no where pronounce him puniſhable and blameable for the vibrations of his brain, the motion of his blood, or the flow of his animal ſpirits; and the argument ſtands briefly thus, Whoever is not worthy of blame for the acts of theft or murder cannot be deſerving of puniſhment, but no man is worthy of blame for ſuch actions, and of conſequence is not deſerving of puniſhment by the laws of his country, nor in the righteous judgment of God. This argument ſurely makes a ragged and contemptible figure in the philoſophical ſchools of common ſenſe, whatever brilliant

appearance

appearance it ſhall be allowed to make in the unadorned and unſwept apartments of a philoſophical neceſſity.

Thirdly. Let us try once more in the following inſtance, for many may be produced in the ordinary courſe of human life, if this axiom or ſelf-evident truth, that evil as evil cannot be the choice of any being, will warrant the truth of this neceſſity propoſition, that every man is obliged to do every thing which he does beyond any poſſibility of doing otherwiſe.

Firſt. Let us ſuppoſe that a tradeſman ſtanding behind his counter ſhould deal out fifteen ounces and half for a pound, and thirty-five inches of cloth for a yard; nor can it be denied but by ſuch actions he muſt defraud and do evil to his neighbour.

Secondly. It is evident that this evil is not choſen as an evil but for its apparent natural tendency to raiſe a fortune in leſs time than it can be done by acting honeſtly in obedience to the laws of God and his country, by dealing out ſixteen ounces for a pound, and thirty-ſix inches for a yard; but if the agreeableneſs of this reaſon or motive

motive to diſhoneſty is irreſiſtible, then neceſſity, which, without reſpect of perſons, muſt act univerſally, impartially, and uniformly, cannot leave an honeſt tradeſman in the kingdom: So that the doctrine of philoſophical neceſſity is not the natural effect, growth, or product of this mathematical plantation in the delightful and extenſive plains of truth. And the falſe reaſoning of theſe minute philoſophers will be conſpicuouſly expoſed by a due attention to the following ſelf-evident propoſitions.

Firſt. It is the condition of every rational man, or every rational man is under a neceſſity, to have his mind ſtocked with ideas of things and actions which are called right and wrong, good and evil, or agreeable and contrary to the will of God.

Secondly. It is the condition of every rational to know that he exiſts as a creature and ſubject of God's univerſal family and government.

Thirdly. Every rational is under a neceſſity of perpetually willing, chooſing, and determining to act in a good or bad character.

Fourthly. It is the condition of every rational to be fully ſatisfied that the favour or diſpleaſure of Almighty God muſt attend a dutiful conformity to, or a rebellious violation of, the known laws of God's univerſal family and government.

Fifthly. It is the condition of every rational, or every rational is under a neceſſity of having a power to do right or wrong, good or evil, or to act the part of a dutiful or diſobedient ſubject both of a human and divine government.

Sixthly. It is the condition of every rational to be governed by reaſon; and every rational actually does give a reaſon to himſelf for every thing which he does, whether it be good or bad. But then we muſt remember that there are two kinds reaſons, which I call wrong and invalid, or right and valid: So that when a rational creature does a bad action under the influence of a bad or invalid reaſon, he muſt be blameable in the judgment of his own mind and in the juſticiary determination of his God; and when he does a good action, influenced by a good and valid reaſon, he neceſſarily receives commendation from himſelf, and is an object

of

of favour and reward at the future tribunal of God, to whom he is accountable.

From hence it is evident, that a certain philoſophical and phyſical neceſſity, for which the author of this enquiry is an advocate, muſt be referred to a neceſſity of coming into exiſtence, and after this, of having his mind furniſhed with the idea of a God, of good and bad actions, and of acting the part of a dutiful or diſobedient ſubject. And it is manifeſt alſo, that a phyſical neceſſity cannot be applied to a neceſſity of doing evil beyond any poſſibility of doing good, nor to a neceſſity of doing good beyond any poſſibility of doing evil, becauſe this is contrary to our ideas of ſelf-motion, ſelf-direction, and ſelf-government. Nor can this doctrine of a philoſophical and phyſical neceſſity be admitted without contradicting a conſciouſneſs of exiſtence and of all the ordinary powers of humanity. But it is the peculiar turn and fault of modern philoſophers to be enquiring into the manner, ſhape, or modes, in which the natural powers of ſpirit and matter are ſuppoſed to operate, ſo that our modern philoſophers are employed in a perpetual inveſtigation of doctrines which, becauſe we are only intereſted

in

in the effects of operation, are entirely uſeleſs; and by making ſimilar enquiries in the moral and metaphyſical parts of ſcience, they are, upon this account, perpetually broaching and introducing opinions, which are not only unprofitable, but highly injurious to the cauſe of virtue and religion, in all human ſocieties.

FINIS.

MVSEVM BRITAN NICVM